1-1-1984

Teachers' responses to children's use of nonstandard English during reading instruction.

Valerie Moss Washington
University of Massachusetts Amherst

TEACHERS' RESPONSES TO CHILDREN'S USE OF NONSTANDARD ENGLISH DURING READING INSTRUCTION

A Dissertation Presented

By

VALERIE MOSS WASHINGTON

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

May 1984

Education

TEACHERS' RESPONSES TO CHILDREN'S USE OF NONSTANDARD ENGLISH DURING READING INSTRUCTION

A Dissertation Presented

By

VALERIE MOSS WASHINGTON

Approved as to style and content by:

Bailey Jackson, Chairperson of Committee

Dalton Miller-Jones, Member

Harry Seymour, Member

Mario D. Fantini, Dean
School of Education

Dedicated

to

All Children
Who Strive to Overcome the Many Barriers to Literacy

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Each of us has reached our present stage of development as a result of interaction with numerous persons. I have been fortunate in that most of my experiences have been positive; adding to my knowledge and strengths and helping me to achieve my goals.

I would like to thank the members of my Dissertation Committee for their knowledge, guidance and support throughout the process. Special thanks to Dr. Bailey Jackson, Chairperson, for opening the door and continually helping me to maneuver along a difficult and sometimes convoluted route; to Dr. Harry Seymour, for his expertise in Black English and constructive criticism, especially in the development of the methodology; and to Dr. Dalton Miller-Jones, first, for his unwavering enthusiasm and confidence, and secondly, for his knowledge in the area of reading and his assistance with the analysis and synthesis of the component parts of this study.

I am indebted to the principals and teachers whose cooperation and participation were necessary for the completion of this study. I thank them for welcoming me to their schools and classrooms and their children, whose warm, trusting smiles, and eagerness to demonstrate their abilities, made the data gathering process an enjoyable experience.

I am especially grateful to friends and family whose love, understanding and support helped to sustain me throughout the process.

A special thanks to my husband, Earl, for his patience, understanding and moral support.

To my daughter, Kerry, for her love, maturity, independence and trust, which enabled me to pursue my studies.

To my parents, especially my mother, who long ago set the high standards and expectations, and encouraged me to continue my education.

A special thanks to my colleagues and friends:

Dr. Clementine Pugh, Dr. Roger Witherspoon and Dr. Joe Jackson, who initially "led the way" and continually "looked back" with love, encouragement, and support to make certain I passed each hurdle.

I am grateful to Dr. Sally LaPoint Gabriel, a new friend, who opened her heart and home and was always nearby with a guiding hand and needed information.

To Charles Bell, Donna Brindell, and Dr. Angela Jorge, for their words of encouragement which truly helped.

To Dr. Pat Thompson, for her editing and proofreading skills.

To my family and friends who acted as surrogate mothers and family to Kerry and served as a most valuable and needed support system: Lori Pugh; my sister, Daphne Moss; Hilma Moore; and Chieko Powell.

To my nephews, Rahim and Jared, and to Nicole, Tomiko, and Akira, for sharing their families with Kerry.

ABSTRACT

Teachers' Responses to Children's Use of Nonstandard English During Reading Instruction

(May, 1984)

Valerie Moss Washington, B.A., Hunter College

M.S., Hunter College

Ed.D., University of Massachusetts

Directed by: Professor Bailey Jackson

This research examined interactive behavior between teachers and children during reading instruction. The major focus of this study was teachers' responses to pupils' use of nonstandard English during reading instruction.

The purposes of the study were:

(1) To identify and classify teachers' responses to pupils' use of nonstandard English;

(2) To assess a possible cause and effect relationship between teacher knowledge and attitude about nonstandard English and their responses to children's nonstandard miscues during reading instruction;

(3) To determine whether teachers' responses differ depending on the more or less frequent presence of nonstandard features in pupils' speech.

The final sample upon which statistical analysis was based consisted of two teachers and their respective second grade classes, totalling fifty-eight pupils.

Each teacher was tested using the Test of Black English for Teachers of Bidialectal Students (TBETB) to determine her knowledge of structure and language arts pedagogy regarding Black English and her attitude toward it. A sentence repetition task determined the extent of dialect use of each child. During reading instruction, children's oral reading miscues and teachers' responses were recorded manually and on audiotape. Data were reported using percentages, means, miscue rates, Pearson Product Moment Correlations and Analysis of Variance.

Teachers were sufficiently different, according to the TBETB, to compare interactions with pupils during reading instruction. Negative attitudes toward Black English were not evident for either.

Teacher One was less knowledgeable about Black English; she had more negative responses than Teacher Two for nonstandard English miscues. Both teachers responded differentially to children depending on the extent of nonstandard English use; however the responses of Teacher One were more limited and negative toward the children classified as strong nonstandard English speakers.

The most frequently occurring responses were "no response" and "teacher supplies correction" for standard and nonstandard English reading miscues.

Teachers did differ in their responses to nonstandard English oral reading miscues. This differential behavior may be due to lack of knowledge about the nonstandard form and about effective language and reading instructional strategies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION iv

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS v

ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION vii

LIST OF TABLES xi

Chapter
I. INTRODUCTION 1

Statement of the Problem 4
Purpose of the Study 5
Research Questions 6
Definition of Terms 8
Significance of the Study 9

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 12

Teacher Attitudes Toward Nonstandard English 12
Teacher Knowledge of Black English 14
Classroom and Pupil/Teacher Interaction 17
Potential Sources of Structural Interferences of Black English During the Reading Process 21
Phonological interference 21
Grammatical interference 24
Semantic interference 27
Teachers' Responses to Pupils' Oral Reading Miscues 29

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 35

Overview 35
Teacher Selection 36
School Selection 37
Pupil Selection 37
Instruments 39
Tests of Black English for Teachers of Bidialectal Students (TBETB) 39
Sentence repetition task 40
Informal reading inventory 45
Standardized test 45
Classroom Observations 46
Coding Procedures 46
Data Analysis 49
Limitations of the Study 50

Chapter
IV. RESULTS 53

Instruments 53
Tests of Black English for Teachers of Bidialectal Students (TBETB) 53
Sentence repetition task 56
Standardized reading test 56
Classroom Observation 59
Research Questions 63
Classroom Procedures 75

V. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION 78

Conclusions 83
Suggestions for Further Research 85

. . . . . .

BIBLIOGRAPHY 87

APPENDICES 94

A. Ceras Test of Black English for Teachers of Bidialectal Students (TBETB) 95

B. Sentence Repetition Task 111

C. Observation Sheet for Pupil Miscues and Teacher Responses 114

D. Oral Reading Observational System Observer Manual 116

E. Oral Reading Observational Coding Sheet 122

F. Means for Teacher Responses to Nonstandard English Miscues by Language Categories and Teachers 124

LIST OF TABLES

1. Test Item Categories (TBETB) 41

2. Tally Sheet for Analysis of Nonstandard English Repetition Task for Each Child 43

3. Behavioral Categories of the Oral Reading Observational System 47

4. Distribution of Incorrect and Correct Items for the Test of Black English for Teachers of Bidialectal Students (TBETB) 55

5. Distribution of Children by Teacher According to the Extent of Nonstandard Dialect Use 57

6. Summary of Reading Grade Equivalent Scores for the California Achievement Test, April 1983, by Teacher and Extent of Nonstandard Use 58

7. Summary of Total Words Read, Miscues and Miscue Rate for Each Teacher 60

8. Summary of Analysis of Variance for the Miscue Rate 61

9. Summary of Positive and Negative Teacher Responses to Pupils' Miscues and Nonstandard English Miscues 62

10. Summary of Total Responses by Teachers Including the Total Frequency, Mean and Percent of Total Responses . . . 65

11. Distribution of Reading Miscues Including Nonstandard English Miscues by Language Categories: Strong (1), Mild (2), and Weak (3) 66

12. Analysis of Variance of Substitution (Nonstandard English) Miscues--Between Teachers 68

13. Analysis of Variance of Omission (Nonstandard English) Miscues--Between Teachers 69

14. Significance Levels of Correlations of Pupils' Nonstandard English Miscues and Teachers' Responses 72

15. Significance Levels of Correlations of Nonstandard English Miscues (by Teacher and Language Categories) and Teacher Behaviors 73

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Many Black and other culturally different children fail to achieve adequate levels of competence in reading. It has been argued that various features of the inner city children's speech (i.e., phonology, syntax, vocabulary and pragmatics) directly interfere with their learning to read standard English. This study investigates an alternative source acting to produce reading failure. It is hypothesized here that teachers' attitudes and behaviors, their knowledge of and values held towards nonstandard English, will significantly influence the children's learning to read.

Many Black and other minority children speak a dialect which differs significantly from standard English. Frequently teachers react negatively to students who speak various forms of nonstandard English and refer to it as "sloppy speech." The use of Black English is associated with low socioeconomic status and is interpreted as evidence of limited cognitive ability. Since Black English and other forms of nonstandard speech are considered substandard and stigmatized, teachers are resistant to learning about them (Baratz, 1969; Burling, 1973; Wolfram and Fasold, 1979). In addition, the existence of racism and classism has caused negative judgments and attitudes to be made about most aspects of nonmainstream life including the Black experience and Black communicative styles. An exception to this occurs when words, expressions or lifestyle become popularized, as a result of acceptance

by prestigious groups and are then widely used (Haskins and Butts, 1973; Burling, 1973).

Teachers recognize the mismatch between the children's dialect and the school dialect, i.e., standard English. However, lack of knowledge about language and dialects, their development and differences, may lead teachers to adhere to a deficit concept about dialects. This deficit concept stigmatizes these children and their speech, and teachers may set low expectations and achievement standards for their pupils. In addition, teachers are more often misinformed or uninformed about the socio- and psycholinguistic factors which are in operation during communication. These include the relationship between language and culture and interference between the primary language (a nonstandard dialect) and the secondary language (standard dialect) being learned. Teachers' attitudes about children and their nonstandard dialect and children's attitudes about teachers and the standard dialect they use are important to the learning process. Without the knowledge and understanding of these socio- and psycholinguistic factors, teachers unsuccessfully persist in attempting to irradicate nonstandard patterns from children's speech (Wolfram and Fasold, 1979). Research has shown that teachers who have learned about language difference have a more positive attitude toward children who use nonstandard English (Billiard and Driscoll, 1980; Landry, 1976; Pietras, 1979).

Normal language development has been identified as one of the components necessary for a successful experience in beginning reading. Therefore, reading readiness and pre-school programs stress activities focusing

on language development. Early research (Bereiter and Engleman, 1966; Deutsch, 1969; Bernstein, 1973; and Jensen, 1973) described Black children's language as deficient, and Black English has been linked to Black children's failure in learning to read. Since then, however, other researchers (Labov, et al., 1968; Wolfram, 1969; and Fasold, 1969) have concluded that the language Black children use is structured, regular, and rule-governed and not a haphazard aberration of standard English. The characteristics of Black English have been described at length. An analysis of the speech of individuals using Black English shows the linguistic pattern reflects certain phonological and morphological rules. Use of this nonstandard dialect is not the result of cognitive or linguistic deficiencies. Instead, the use of nonstandard forms of English reflect the internalization of the language of their community.

Available knowledge about language and dialects does not provide sufficient evidence for linking reading failure to the use of nonstandard forms of a language. It appears that erroneous information has been used to establish a cause and effect relationship between failure in learning to read and the use of nonstandard dialects. In this study teachers' knowledge and attitude about Black (American) English was measured. Black English was used as representative of nonstandard dialects. A premise of this study is that teachers' lack of knowledge about nonstandard dialects results in their use of ineffective instructional techniques. These techniques result in misunderstandings between pupils and teacher and disrupt the learning process (Piestrup, 1973) particularly during reading instruction.

Teacher strategies and attitudes are based on their knowledge and understanding of the objectives of the curriculum and the children's needs. If that basic knowledge and understanding is incomplete or based on misinformation, the teacher may be formulating and communicating, through classroom interaction during the teaching/learning process, negative and damaging attitudes about children's cognitive ability, linguistic background, ethnicity, and academic potential. For these reasons, it is the teacher-child interaction in the learning environment which must be observed, recorded, and analyzed in order to identify teacher behaviors which are related to academic failure among children who are nonstandard dialect speakers.

Statement of the Problem

There is sufficient evidence that many Black children are failing to learn to read. Language development has been identified as an important factor in the process of learning reading, and language differences among Black children have been considered a significant factor in their failure in reading. Thus far, research has not been able to successfully identify those specific elements of Black English which interfere or conflict with the process of learning to read. Researchers in their efforts to remediate reading failure have tried adapting teaching methods to the language of the child, for example, using English as a second language methodology or adapting materials to the speaker's language such as the use of texts written in Black English. Labov (1967) focused on educating teachers about Black English. He believed

that using positive reinforcement when pupils read correctly and not interrupting reading continually to correct dialect based miscues was a more effective technique in reading instruction. Piestrup (1973) recorded teacher responses to the Black English speaker in an attempt to investigate dialect interference on learning to read and to find out how teachers accommodate instruction for Black English speakers. In support of the Piestrup study, Simons (1979) suggests we look at classroom interaction between the teacher and pupils during the teaching/learning process.

This study is concerned with the unsubstantiated relationship that has been suggested between the language used by many Black children and other children who use nonstandard forms of speech and their failure in learning to read. This study proposes that the problems Black children are experiencing in learning to read are related more to the teachers' knowledge, attitude, and responses to the children's use of nonstandard English than to interferences from the dialect per se. The following question is the focal point of this research: What is the effect of children's use of nonstandard English on teacher instructional behavior?

Purpose of the Study

The purposes of this exploratory study were:

1. To identify and classify teachers' responses to pupils' use of nonstandard English.

2. To assess a possible cause and effect relationship between teachers' knowledge and attitude about nonstandard English and their choices of responses to nonstandard English miscues during reading instruction.

3. To determine whether teachers' responses differ depending on the more or less frequent presence of nonstandard features in pupils' speech.

Classroom interaction during oral reading instruction has been minimally explored. Teacher interaction with children who speak nonstandard English has been researched to an even lesser degree (Piestrup, 1973; Roberts, 1973). Therefore, this exploratory study represents an attempt to provide descriptive data on interaction of teachers with children who use nonstandard English during reading instruction. Hypotheses will be generated for further investigation.

Research Questions

The analysis of the data addresses the following questions:

1. What is the pattern of teachers' responses to the various types of reading miscues?

2. What is the frequency of teachers' responses to the various types of miscues?

3. What percentage of miscues (listed below) are the result of use of nonstandard English?

   (3.1) Incomplete response (child responds partially, i.e., initial sound[s]);

   (3.2) Substitutions (child says something else for what is written);

   (3.3) Omissions (child omits a sound[s] or word[s]);

   (3.4) Additions (child adds a sound[s] or words[s]);

   (3.5) Scramble (child mixes up sequences of sounds or words).

4. What is the pattern of teachers' responses to pupils' oral reading miscues and how is it related to nonstandard use of English generally and relative to the extent of dialect present?

5. How is the pattern of teachers' responses to nonstandard English used during reading related to their knowledge of and attitude toward Black English as measured by the Tests of Black English for Teachers of Bidialectal Students (TBETB)?

   Does the teacher who is more knowledgeable and has more positive attitudes toward nonstandard English:

   (5.1) Give more positive feedback;

   (5.2) Supply fewer corrections;

   (5.3) Call on another child less frequently;

   (5.4) Provide contextual strategy or clue;

   (5.5) Provide a decoding strategy or clue;

   (5.6) Not respond to the miscue?

Definition of Terms

Certain terms are used frequently throughout this study; their definitions are presented here:

Dialect: Each spoken variety of a language is a dialect. All of the dialects of a language are mutually intelligible but differ to some degree in vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation. Standard English and Black English are both dialects of English. Dialect differences are caused by geography, social class, education, age, profession, race, and situation (Dale, 1976).

Standard English: Standard English is the dialect of English considered to be "correct," "prestigious," and "not stigmatized." It is thought to be spoken by educated, middle-class, high status individuals who set the standards.

Nonstandard English: Nonstandard English is the dialect of English considered to be "incorrect," "non-prestigious," and "stigmatized." It is thought to be spoken by uneducated, low-class, low-status individuals who do not set the standards. Black English (dialect) is considered a nonstandard dialect. Therefore, in this study, references to nonstandard English include Black English.

Black English: A nonstandard dialect of English spoken to a greater or lesser degree by many Black Americans. It includes features which are more commonly found among Black speakers than White, although features may also appear in the speech of those who live in close proximity to a Black community where Black English is used. It shows "regional variation both in form and in degree of deviation from standard English. . . . Black English has certain distinctive and relatively consistent patterns of sound, sentence structure, and vocabulary" (Kossack, 1980). In this study, Black English refers to American Black English features.

Responses: Those techniques or strategies (questions, statements, directives) used by the teacher or another child in response to a child's reading miscues. These may be verbal or nonverbal behaviors.

Miscue (Error) Episode: Miscue episode in this study refers to the sequence of pupil-teacher interactive behaviors bounded by the occurrence of a reading miscue and the teacher's response or other resolution to the error including the child's self correction.

Miscue Ratio (Rate): Miscue ratio (rate) refers to the number of miscue episodes compared to the total number of words read.

$$\frac{\text{The number of miscue episodes}}{\text{The total number of words read}}$$

Oral Reading Observation System: An instrument for coding pupil-teacher interactive behavior after reading sessions (Roberts, 1973).

Oral Reading Miscue: An oral reading miscue refers to the deviation from the text in oral reading by omission, substitution, addition, insertion, or other incomplete response to the written page.

Significance of the Study

There is considerable concern about the large numbers of Black and other minority children who continue to fail to learn to read or who

read poorly. The existence of deficit theories (linguistic, cognitive, and cultural) have kept the responsibility of learning in the hands of the child, with minimal accountability expected of teachers and administrators. This continues in spite of considerable research which identifies the teachers' attitudes as most influential in its effects on children's growth and development (Clark, 1971; Rosenshire, et al., 1973).

In an attempt to identify and classify teachers' responses to pupils' use of nonstandard English and subsequently to determine whether teachers' knowledge and attitude about Black English are factors in the teachers' choices of responses, it is hoped that insight can be gained about those responses which are most effective in teaching reading to children who speak nonstandard English.

Since previous research has focused on child performance only and since the teaching/learning process involves communication and interaction between teachers and pupils, examination of this process should provide information about linguistic interference, communication difficulties, or other patterns of behavior during reading instruction that significantly influence reading achievement. Extensive research has been done on classroom interaction, but few studies have focused on reading instruction and more specifically on the speaker of nonstandard English.

This study will explore teachers' responses to children's miscues and use of nonstandard English during reading instruction. This information will be used in developing teacher education materials that

focus on and describe classroom instructional strategies. The results of this study should have application for college professors who teach inservice and preservice teachers who work with children who speak non-standard English.

Chapter I of this dissertation has provided an introduction to the present research. The statement of the problem, purpose, research questions, definitions of terms, and significance of this study have been described.

Chapter II will provide a background and review of the literature on teacher attitudes toward Black English, teacher knowledge of Black English, classroom teacher/pupil interaction, potential sources of structural interferences of Black English during the reading process, and teacher responses to pupils' oral reading miscues.

Chapter III describes the methodology, the processes used in selecting the study population, instrumentation, research design, statistical procedures and limitations.

Chapter IV presents a summary, findings and conclusions. Implications and recommendations for further research are discussed.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A review of the literature disclosed the following areas pertinent to the purpose of this study. They are: (1) teacher attitude toward nonstandard English; (2) teacher knowledge of Black English; (3) classroom teacher/pupil interaction; (4) potential sources of structural interference of Black English during the reading process, and (5) teacher responses to pupils' oral reading miscues.

Teacher Attitudes Toward Nonstandard English

In recent years, evidence has accumulated to support the hypothesis that there is a relationship between the low achievement of children who speak nonstandard English and teachers' negative attitudes toward them. It is suggested here that these attitudes generate feelings of inadequacy and inferiority which lead to failure in learning to read. They appear to have a greater influence on the process of learning to read than does the dialect itself. Consequently, these attitudes can influence the teachers' initial judgments and subsequent placement of children in classes and in reading groups. In addition, they affect the way children's contributions in class are treated by the teacher and classmates. In turn, self concepts are lowered and negative feelings about self in relation to peers result. These feelings undermine self-confidence and consequently lessen an individual's willingness to

participate and to achieve (Goodman and Sims, 1974; Gushkin, 1970; Hall, 1980; Light, 1971; Seymour and Miller-Jones, 1981; Rist, 1970). Labov (1969) states,

> It is widely recognized that the teachers' attitude towards the child is an important factor in his success or failure. . . . When the everyday language of Negro children is stigmatized as 'not a language at all' and 'not possessing the means for logical thought,' the effect of such a labeling is repeated many times during each day of the school year. Every time that a child uses a form of NNE (Negro nonstandard English) without the copula or with a negative concord, he will be labeling himself for the teacher's benefit as illogical, and a 'nonconceptual thinker.' Bereiter and Engelman, Deutsch and Jensen are giving teachers a ready-made theoretical basis for the prejudice they already feel against the lower class Negro child and his language (p. 54).

Torrey (1973) supports Labov's view and characterizes these attitudes as creating functional interferences. Functional interferences are related to cultural not linguistic differences and can negatively affect the learning process. As a result, the atmosphere, vis-à-vis positive relationships between children, teachers, and the school, do not develop. An effective learning environment is not created. Trudgill (1979), in describing the relationships between language and the school, states that problems in school frequently develop because of attitudes expressed about dialect forms. He says, "teachers react more favorably to children who speak standard English than to those who do not. They evaluate the standard English speakers as being more intelligent and having greater potential than other children" (p. 76). Additionally, teachers grade reading miscues that fall into patterns characteristic of nonstandard English less favorably than those that do not. That is, teachers are less likely to accept reading miscues

that are forms of Black English, even though they are syntactically and semantically correct (Tovey, 1979). This is supported by Williams, 1970; Hewitt, 1971; Williams, Whitehead and Miller, 1972.

The research described above substantiates the relationship between negative teacher attitudes toward nonstandard English speakers and speakers' low achievement. Although a direct cause and effect has not been established, sufficient evidence exists regarding the effects of teacher attitudes on students' self concept and achievement to infer an interrelationship with language. Since language is an integral part of a person's identity and culture, clearly a denigrating posture toward an individual's language can influence teacher behavior, peer interaction, and self concept. These, in turn, will impact on the individual's reading performance and general sense of well being.

Teacher Knowledge of Black English

Research has shown that teachers who are educated (knowledgeable about dialect and language difference [Black English] and cultural diversity) have a more positive attitude toward children who use nonstandard English and greater comprehension of their speech (Billiard and Driscoll, 1980; Landry, 1976; Pietras, 1979). Nober and Seymour (1974) found that inexperienced white student teachers have speech recognition problems with Black children and suggested that these teachers would benefit from structured auditory training. This would improve their comprehension of Black children's speech and also communication between teacher and child. Hutchinson (1972) and Hunt (1974-1975) found that

when analyzing children's oral reading errors, eliminating those errors which were representative of Black English speech patterns results in substantial increases in the interpretation of their reading ability. In addition, Hunt (1974-1975) found that the increase was consistent with the child's demonstrated ability to comprehend what was read. The oral reading miscues reflected the child's translation of the content into his own communicative system but not the inability to decode and comprehend. This ability to translate from one code system to another is considered to be the basis of fluent reading with understanding (Trudgill, 1976; Smith, 1977; Goodman, 1974). Teachers, however, in order to accurately perceive this ability require knowledge about what these nonstandard language characteristics are. This will enable them to distinguish nonstandard English miscues from miscues generally. That awareness would enable them to make more informed evaluations of the children's reading achievement. Teachers' inability to do so penalizes children and lowers their actual achievement level and sometimes creates a reading atmosphere which is punitive, rejecting, and confusing. For example, the reading period may be used as a time for dialect correction. Berdan (1980) says,

> Dialect intervention under the guise of reading instruction, however noble the intent, is frequently perceived by the child as aversive, sometimes even abusive. And children quickly learn strategies to keep getting hurt. They mumble; they read in a whisper; they refuse to speak at all. . . . In fact, the problem is not necessarily that children do not learn to read; rather as they move from first to second to third grade, they seem to learn to avoid having to read . . . an immediate useful strategy with long-term negative consequences (p. 79).

Gushkin (1970) suggests that teachers, through training or through retraining programs, be provided an opportunity to explore their own

language beliefs and biases and to learn more about linguistic differences. Lamberg and McCaleb (1977) found that prospective teachers were inconsistent in their ability to identify dialect aspects of speech during oral reading. They also suggest that a teacher training program should include teaching about dialect difference to enable teachers to use this knowledge effectively when evaluating pupils' oral reading. Paulson (1978) indicates that pre-service teachers' expectations of pupils' social and academic classroom behavior is influenced by pupils' dialect, ethnicity, and also by participation in an introductory sociolinguistics course.

Politzer and Lewis (1980) studied the relationship among teacher performance on the Tests of Black English for Teachers of Bidialectal Students (TBETB), teacher behaviors, and the achievement of Black English speaking students. They observed specific teaching behaviors such as direct correction, establishing a purpose or readiness for instruction, and directly relevant teaching in response to pupils' use of Black English. For one research site, teacher performance on the TBETB did relate significantly to pupil achievement. There was an absence of any observed overt behavior related to Black English. However, the results support previous findings that children's achievement is positively affected by directly related teaching strategies and by teachers' avoidance of confusing or incorrect information. These findings are significant because they show that lack of knowledge about Black English can lead to teaching behaviors that are inappropriate or confusing; and misunderstanding can result from dialect difference and

consequently interfere with the learning process. Piestrup (1973) and Goodman and Sims (1974) arrived at similar conclusions.

Although limited in scope, these studies show that knowledge about linguistics and sociolinguistics can positively affect teachers' attitudes about children's use of nonstandard English. The research indicates that increased knowledge and understanding of linguistics translates, ultimately, into a more positive atmosphere in the classroom, higher expectations of children, and increased performance and achievement. This is important for an understanding of classroom pupil/teacher interaction.

Classroom and Pupil/Teacher Interaction

Piestrup (1973) examined the classroom communication process by recording interaction during reading lessons. Her findings suggest that the ways in which teachers respond to children's reading errors are especially significant. Sometimes reading errors are caused by dialect interferences which are either functional or structural. Functional interferences are related to differences in cultural background and structural interferences to linguistic differences. Functional interferences frequently result from teachers' responses to structural (linguistic) conflict. The latter are reflected in rejection of Black speech, by tone, gesture, silence, or actual comment or correction, that often imply disrespect for the child and his language. The result is a form of functional interference as the child "acts out" or refuses to participate or withdraws in silence. These functional conflicts totally

block the learning process as involvement and learning cease. Simons and Johnson (1975), in commenting on Piestrup's study, claim that there were frequent episodes where teachers confused pupils who use Black English. Simons (1973) felt the teacher/child language interchange needed to be examined in order to gather information about why Black children are not experiencing success in learning to read. In analyzing a verbal interchange from Piestrup's (1973) study, Simons (1975) speculated that a communication problem existed because:

(1) The teacher and child did not share a common language background, e.g., standard English vs. Black dialect.

(2) The strategies used by the teacher to elicit responses were unfamiliar and confusing to the child.

(3) The above detracted from the reading task. The communication problem led to interference in learning to read.

Goodman and Sims (1974) discuss these ideas also and use as an example the child who says "hep" instead of "helped" and is corrected. The child may think he has not correctly identified the word or become confused about the final "ed" sound. They suggest that if the child's fluent reading, even though in dialect, indicates that meaning is received, the oral reading should be accepted rather than confuse the child by making unnecessary corrections.

Delamont (1976) has analyzed classroom interaction between teachers and children. She described the teacher as being in control of classroom knowledge, behavior and speech. She stated, "Teachers have the right to monitor and correct pupils' talk in ways that differ sharply from the norms of everyday conversation" (p. 49). That is,

interrupting children speaking, rejecting the way they express themselves and making corrections are allowable under the guise of teaching. She also discussed the way in which the self-fulfilling prophecy works in relation to teachers' attitudes and expectations. Teachers assess children's backgrounds and language and use that information to draw conclusions about their academic potential. The level of expectation is based on that and the children are taught (or not taught) accordingly. In the process, children internalize these feelings and attitudes and their behavior reflects their perceptions of these expectations: excelling or failing. Brophy and Good (1974) have found that teachers give advantages to children who are thought to be brighter. They are more patient, provide more assistance in response to their questions, and more accepting of the brighter children's responses. Delamont states, "Such qualitative and quantitative differences in teacher-pupil interaction, based on the teachers' beliefs about pupil abilities have been demonstrated in all types of schools" (p. 71). Since nonstandard (Black) English is stigmatized and considered a reflection of lack of cultural, as well as linguistic and cognitive, ability, teachers respond to children who speak Black English by lowering expectations and making fewer academic demands. The children internalize these attitudes, and the result is lower achievement. Stubbs (1976) states, "If a school considers a pupil's language to be inadequate, then she or he will probably fail in the formal educational system" (p. 15).

Delamont also discusses questioning techniques, the most prevalent form of classroom conversation. Teachers ask questions to test pupils and they make every effort to respond correctly. Middle-class homes in which parents prepare children for the school experience by engaging in this kind of question and answer "game," provide more continuity between their home, culture, and the school. These children, therefore, have an advantage over other children who do not know how to play this "conversational game." Hall (1980) also refers to this continuity of perceptual and behavioral abilities between the home and school. He questions whether cultures which differ from that of the school provide differential opportunities for their children to engage in interactions which are similar to the instructional dialogue. If not, the result may be that children's responses are frequently incomplete and incorrect. These are interpreted by the teacher as further evidence of limited cognitive ability. Again, misinformed interaction with the child is the basis for misinterpretations about the child and results in the teacher's development of lack of confidence in the child's ability to succeed. Teachers' overt and covert actions communicate that message in the child.

Shuy (1979) says,

> To say that more emphasis should be placed on educating teachers about language functions so that they can better understand, appreciate and diagnose problems in their students is a gross understatement. Various studies have shown that teachers are not adequately trained to diagnose student problems related to language (Shuy, 1970). Reading teachers, in particular, suffer from receiving information only on methods of teaching reading, without knowledge of linguistics, which would enable them to distinguish between a pronunciation problem and a grammatical miscue; without

> knowledge of psychology, which would enable them to evaluate the gestalt of reading and distinguish it from its component parts; and without knowledge of the cultural aspects of reading, which would enable them to distinguish reading problems from sex-role fulfillment or group membership pressures (pp. 199-200).

Potential Sources of Structural Interference of Black English During the Reading Process

Structural interference refers to the conflict resulting when two linguistic systems come into contact with each other as an individual attempts to learn a second dialect or language, i.e., standard English and Black English. The conflict occurs because the first language or dialect imposes its phonology and grammar onto the second language or dialect the individual is trying to learn (Johnson, 1971). It is widely believed that these interferences are factors which may cause reading failure among children who speak nonstandard English. However, the research is inconclusive and conflicting (Hall, 1980; Schwartz, 1982).

Phonological interference. Phonological interference refers to the fact that certain words in Black English are pronounced or sound differently from the standard form. In some instances, it occurs when there is a reduction of sounds such as the final /t/ in "past" which is then pronounced "pas." Another example is the omission of /r/ or /l/. Examples are guard which becomes god or help which becomes hep. As a result, Black English contains homophones which are not present in standard English such as "pin" and "pen" or "col" and "cold." A summary of the

major differences in phonology between standard and Black English follows:

Phonology

a. Reduction of a final consonant of a consonant cluster. The final consonant may be omitted under the following circumstances: (1) when both consonants of a cluster belong to the same word, test → tes, hand → han; and (2) when past tense suffix ed is added to a word, rubbed → rub, missed → mis (this rule operates only when both members of the final cluster are either voiced or voiceless). In addition, the environment of vowel following consonant cluster may produce best apple → bes apple.

b. Production of /ð/ and /θ/. The representation of /ð/ and /θ/ in Black English depends on the phonemic environment in which they occur. In the initial position of a word, the voiced interdental fricative /ð/ is often pronounced as d, i.e., this/dis. The voiceless interdental fricative (/θ/), as in thin, may be pronounced with a t (tin). When /ð/ occurs within a word, it is represented by v and the voiceless /θ/ by f: the same substitutions occur for the final position of words. Thus, in Black English it is not uncommon to hear for then, author and mouth, den, aufuh, and mouf.

c. Production of /r/ and /l/. In Black English, the /r/ and /l/ may be reduced to uh, i.e., steal and sister becomes steauh and sistuh. The /r/ and /l/ may also be omitted when they precede a consonant in a word or follow an /o/ or /u/ which produces homonyms of words as toe and toll. The /r/ and /l/ may also be omitted between vowels, i.e., carol would be pronounced ca'ol.

d. Devoicing of final b, d, and g. Devoicing of some consonants in unstressed syllables may occur in standard English. However, in Black English this devoicing may take place for the stressed and unstressed syllables, as in acit for acid and foot for food. Voiced plosives b, d, and g may be pronounced as p, t, and k at the end of a syllable. For example, pig, lid and lab may be pronounced pik, lit, and lap, respectively. Distinctions between words

affected by the devoicing rule and the apparent homonyms are maintained by the prolongation of the vowels.

e. Vowel glide production. When preceding a voiceless consonant such as kite and flight, the vowel or diphthongs /ay/ and /oy/ are pronounced with a glide.

f. Nasalization. The g of ing words such as singing may be dropped (singin'). Vowels which precede a nasal sound may be nasalized and the nasal sound not pronounced. Thus, words such as rum, and rung might be homophonous in Black English.

g. Stress patterns. Some standard English words of more than one syllable have their stress on the second syllable rather than the first. The stress for some multiple syllabic words may be reversed in Black English, i.e., po'lice, 'police; ho'tel, 'hotel. (Seymour and Miller-Jones, 1981, pp. 216-217)

It has been speculated that these pronunciation differences cause decoding problems in reading, especially, for phonics based programs (Trudgill, 1979; Jones, 1979). Thus far, however, studies have not supported the hypothesis of phonological interferences (Melmed, 1971; Rystrom, 1970; Simons, 1974). Troutman (1982) discussed the research findings of Hall, Turner and Russell (1974) in which they assessed children's ability to imitate sentences by repetition and children's comprehension by their ability to select the picture which best represented the sentence repeated. Hall, Turner and Russell found no evidence to conclude that lower-class Black children were at a disadvantage in comprehending standard English. Lui (1975-1976) examined miscues of Black children reading Black English and standard English in order to investigate possible syntactic and semantic interference of Black English in

reading. Thirty subjects in grades 2 and 3 read a story in Black English and standard English. Comprehension was measured by the child's ability to retell the story. There was no difference in performance (oral reading) between the Black English and standard English forms nor in comprehension.

Rigg (1978) states, "Phonological dialect miscues--those differences between the author's sound system and the reader's sound system--have no effect on comprehension and can be ignored" (p. 286). Burling (1973) feels that rather than interrupt and correct pronunciation differences, Black children should be taught the ways in which their pronunciation corresponds to conventional spelling. Instead of attempting to change Black English pronunciation, children should be taught to decode homophones applicable to their speech. It is very likely that successful readers have, independently, through trial and error, learned to make these accommodations since standard dialect is the first and only dialect in which they have received reading instruction.

Grammatical interference. Grammatical interference refers to the mismatch between Black English sentence structure (including negation and question formulation), and grammar (including the use of verb tense, pronouns, and plurals), and the standard English in reading textbooks. It has been presumed that these syntactical differences will interfere with the child's ability to decode and comprehend.

Simons and Johnson (1974) compared the way 67 Black children in grades 2 and 3 in three elementary schools read in Black English and in

standard English. They found the subjects shifted from Black English to standard English more often than the reverse. The subjects seemed to prefer or to be more comfortable with the standard dialect. There appeared to be no evidence to support the idea of grammatical interference in the reading performance of Black children.

Simons (1979) discusses the following studies which were based on the hypothesis that Black children will read texts written in Black English with greater facility than those written in standard English: Scharf, 1971; Sims, 1972; Simons and Johnson, 1974; Nolem, 1972; Mathewson, 1973; and Marwit and Newman, 1974. To summarize, he found that a variety of reading materials written in Black English and standard English were used. The format varied from oral reading and free-recall to multiple choice comprehension questions. However, the results indicated the children read the Black English and standard versions with equal facility, or read the standard versions better. Therefore, there was no support for the grammatical interference hypothesis. Rigg (1978) states, "Grammatical dialect miscues are like phonological dialect miscues, in that both are minor surface differences, with no change of author's meaning, and with no loss of comprehension" (p. 287). These studies indicate there is nothing, inherent in the grammatical (syntactical) structure of Black English, which negatively affects comprehension. The following is a summary of syntactical differences of Black English from standard English:

Syntax

a. Deletion of ed suffix. The consonant reduction rule discussed under phonology affects ed marking for past tense, past participial forms, and derived adjectives.

Examples are: She finished the job → She finish the job; She is a brown eyed girl → She is a brown eye girl.

b. The regularization of irregular verbs. Some verbs which have irregular past tense forms may be produced by adding ed to the present tense form: He drank water → He drinked water.

c. Deletion of forms of have. The contracted forms 've and 's for the auxiliary have in the past tense forms may be deleted. Examples include: He's gone home → He gone home; I've two books → I two books.

d. Deletion of 's' suffix in third person subject verb agreement. There may be no obligatory suffix 's' marker used to identify the present tense of a verb if the subject of that verb is in the third person singular. An example would be: He runs home → He run home.

e. Deletion of third person singular forms of have and do. Have and do are not transformed to has and does in third person singular constructions such as He has an apple → He have an apple; and He does tricks → He do tricks.

f. Deletion of 's' suffix plural marker. The plural marker is absent for certain nouns that are classified by a plural as in I have five cents → I have five cent.

g. Deletion of 's' suffix possessive marker. The possessive marker is indicated by the order of the words and not by the presence of 's'. For example, John's cousin → John cousin.

h. Deletion of is and are when gonna is used. When is and are are followed by gonna, they may be deleted as in He is going to eat → He gonna eat.

i. Forms of gonna vary. Gonna may be reduced in the following ways: I am going home — I'mana going home → I'mon going home → I'ma going home.

j. Deletion of contracted form of will. The future indicator will may be deleted when contracted and particularly so when followed by a labial consonant, that is He'll marry her → He marry her.

k. Invariant be form of the verb to be. The form be may be used as a main verb such as He is eating → He be eating. This form often refers to a habitual or intermittent action as opposed to a single event.

l. Deletion of contracted is and are. When is and are can be contracted in standard English, they can be deleted in Black English. Examples are: He's strong → He strong; They're strong → They strong.

m. Multiple negation. Negative sentences in Black English may be produced by one or more negative forms. These negatives take one of three forms: (1) negative added to an auxiliary such as can, should, and have; (2) negative added to do, did or does; and (3) conversion of an indefinite such as somebody to its negative form, nobody. In Black English, various multiple negative transformations occur: (1) I have some → I don't have any or I have none → I don't have none; (2) Everybody wants something → Nobody wants anything → Nobody don't want nothing.

n. Questions. There are two basic question formations: Yes - No questions and Wh questions as exemplified by Can we swim? and Where can we swim? Simple question formations require inversion of subject and auxiliary with the insertion of the Wh word in the case of Wh questions. In Black English, the auxiliary may be omitted, as in Can we swim? → We swim? and the inversion may not take place in Wh questions: Where can we swim? → Where we can swim? Standard English embedded questions such as I would like to know if we can swim? do not follow the inversion rule. However, in Black English the if and whether may be omitted and the inversion applied as in I would like to know can he swim? The same pattern may exist for embedded Wh question formations.

o. Pronominal apposition. Pronouns may be used in apposition to the noun subject of the sentence such as My brother, he happy.
(Seymour and Miller-Jones, 1981, pp. 217-218)

Semantic interference. It appears that comprehension is not a problem to Black dialect speakers when the text contains sufficient syntactical and contextual clues to use for clarification (Heilman, 1977). Hall

and Turner (1974) found that Black children who speak Black English have no unique problems in comprehending standard English. Trudgill (1976) states,

> Most British children, when faced with a passage of standard English to read, are rather good at 'translating' it into their own dialect as they go along. Fluent readers, adults and children alike, do not simply register what is on the printed page as they read. They also make predictions about what is coming next. . . . The reader supplies what ought to be there, even when it is not. In the same way, a child when reading aloud, may supply something that does not actually appear on that page; it is predicted according to the rule of his own dialect (pp. 75-76).

If this translation is occurring, it is evidence that the child understands what he is reading. According to Smith (1977), this ability to make meaningful predictions is the basis of comprehension. Weber (1973) analyzed errors in oral reading of Black speakers of standard English and White speakers of standard English who also included some nonstandard forms in their speech. She found the source of difficulty was the difference between spoken language and written language and not the dialect of the speakers. Both groups of children read what they expected to see written. The errors were semantically and grammatically correct within the context. This supports the idea that reading involves prediction and translation. These pupils read what they expected to see written and changed it to match their own dialect. Smarr (1978), in researching Down East Maine dialect, concluded that "the dialect of these subjects, while more frequent during their retellings than during their oral readings, had no effect upon their comprehension or reconstruction of meaning during the reading process."

Goodman (1974) describes the efficient reader as one who,

> . . . samples from the distinctive features of the graphic display using only enough to make a useful prediction about the structures and the meaning. Then they sample again to confirm or contradict their prediction. Too careful reading becomes bogged down in detail so that meaning is lost. . . . If they do make miscues, they become aware of them only if they result in loss of meaning, since they are constantly monitoring the process for meaning (p. 826).

This idea is supported by miscue research. The scores of children whose miscues were related to Black English use were increased when those miscues were not counted. The resulting score was more in tune with the comprehension level the children had demonstrated (Hunt, 1974-1975).

It appears that there is a substantial body of research which does not support the hypothesis of phonological, grammatical and semantic interference of nonstandard English during the reading process.

Teacher Responses to Pupil's Oral Reading Miscues

An oral reading miscue occurs whenever the reader deviates from the written text. They may be categorized as omissions (omitting a word or part of a word), additions (adding a part of a word), insertions (inserting words) or substitutions (replacing what is there in whole or part). Teacher responses are the verbal or nonverbal techniques or strategies used by the teacher in response to a child's oral reading miscues. Initially considered merely mistakes, these miscues are now regarded as providing valuable insight into the reading process and information that

can be utilized to guide reading instruction (K. Goodman, 1965; Mitchell, 1980). Oral reading miscues are cued by something. They are not random behaviors (Allington, 1980). They may be semantically correct, not distorting the meaning of the written text, or syntactically correct, that is, preserving the grammar and syntax of the sentence. Miscues may also provide the teachers with clues as to how the reader perceived the sentence. Sometimes the grapho-phonological aspects of the word; how the word looks and sounds to the reader, is a reflection of the reader's attempt to utilize what has been learned about phonics and decoding.

Bacon (1982) discussed the relationship of teachers' responses to children's oral reading miscues and teachers' applications of reading theory to classroom instruction. He argued that a skill-word oriented approach to teaching reading (Perceptual Theory) which focused on decoding (word parts and sounds) is related to teachers' responses that provide immediate correction of a miscue by supplying the word or a decoding cue or strategy. An advantage of this approach is immediate feedback and correction; however, it is possible that it is frustrating to learners because it interrupts their thought processes and shows lack of confidence in their ability to do it themselves. This type of correction may result in pupils being over-conscious of grapho-phonic information and producing word by word reading. The students do not have the opportunity to discover their errors and to self correct. Self correction, in and of itself, is an important reading skill.

Teachers operating with the Hypothesis Theory of reading take a holistic approach and their method of reading instruction emphasizes getting meaning from print. In this kind of instruction, miscues would be less likely to be corrected immediately if at all. Teachers would respond to miscues differently and selectively, giving the child the opportunity to respond and self correct. Reading is controlled to a greater extent by the child or shared with the teacher. In the process, teachers encourage risk-taking and accept miscues.

Teachers who are considered reading experts respond to reading miscues with a basis in a theoretical framework of the reading process. This knowledge allows them to consciously and deliberately implement reading programs that take a particular direction. No information is available regarding less expert teachers. However, teacher responses to miscues are guided by knowledge and understanding of the reading process and student performance appears to be a reflection of that reading instruction (Mitchell, 1980; Bacon, 1982).

Teacher responses have an immediate effect on pupil performance during the reading task. Some of the possible responses are "no response," "a delayed response," "an immediate correction by giving the child the word," or "a decoding cue or strategy." Other responses tell children directly that they are wrong or right or imply that by complimenting (positive) or scolding (negative) the child. Some responses acknowledge the child's reading but are essentially neutral: "O.K.," "alright." Few researchers have examined teacher responses qualitatively to assess their effects. Research has found differential

treatment toward slower or faster groups. Allington (1980) found that good readers received fewer evaluative comments, were criticized more, and corrective comments more often provided semantic and syntactic information. Roberts (1973) found that teachers wait, allowing better readers to figure out words or self correct their miscues or they do not respond to their miscues at all. By contrast, regardless of semantic acceptability, teachers seem to accept the miscues of poorer readers less often. They provide them with decoding cues and strategies or the word. However, these readers are praised with greater frequency (Allington, 1980; Weinstein, 1976).

Bacon studied specific teacher responses during oral reading in an effort to determine the immediate effect of teacher responses. This was done by examining readers' miscues, corrections, and comprehension. The results indicate that teacher responses had an influence on the number of miscues made, comprehension and the behavior of the child following the miscue. However, the quality of miscues and their causes did not seem to be influenced by teacher responses. He concluded that the "no response" teacher behavior where the entire reading responsibility was left to the child resulted in the most miscues. When the teacher shared the responsibility as with "delayed response" and "focusing on reading for meaning," the teacher interrupted with less frequency and the child read with more accuracy. The "correction response" resulted in the pupils reproducing what was read word by word, with little independence and much attention was paid to correcting miscues. "Delayed response" was the most efficient response. The benefits of its

use resulted in better comprehension, children learning to correct themselves, and the teacher being present to guide them.

Although the "no response" condition allows children complete independence, unless they are being tested, it makes the purpose for reading orally questionable. If there are no teacher responses, perhaps the children should be reading silently because they are not being instructed either.

Few researchers have explored teacher responses to pupils' miscues during oral reading and even fewer have examined miscues which are related to the pupils' use of nonstandard English features during reading. Mention was made previously to Hunt (1974-1975) who showed that pupils' reading scores increased when miscues related to their nonstandard dialect were not counted. This increase was commensurate with their demonstrated comprehension ability. Tovey (1979) found that although teachers give consideration to the syntactic and semantic acceptability of miscues, they are less likely to accept those which are forms of Black English.

This study explores responses to pupils' oral reading miscues which have nonstandard English features. From the literature, it appears that teachers behave differentially to pupils' miscues depending on achievement and ability levels. In addition, teachers' knowledge of the reading process influences the kinds of responses made following reading miscues and reading instructional procedures, generally. Finally, pupils' behavior following teachers' responses to their miscues are affected by those responses. Therefore, teachers'

responses to miscues of children who use nonstandard English in varying degrees will be studied and the relationship of those responses to the teachers' knowledge and attitudes about nonstandard English will be examined. Chapter III describes the research methodology.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Overview

This study represents an attempt to identify and classify teachers' responses to children who use nonstandard English during reading instruction. Two groups of second grade children who use nonstandard English in varying degrees were identified, and each child was administered a sentence repetition task. The sentence repetition task was used to group the children according to their extent of nonstandard English usage. Two classroom teachers were selected to participate in the study. Both teachers were administered the Tests of Black English for Teachers of Bidialectal Students (TBETB). The results showed a difference in their knowledge of structure and language pedagogy relative to Black English.

Thus, the study included two teachers who differed in their knowledge of structure of Black English and language arts pedagogy and whose respective classes included children who were either strong, mild or weak users of Black English and other forms of nonstandard English. Following the selection of pupils and teachers, the classes were informally observed in order to understand the format of reading instruction and daily procedures. The children were observed for a series of reading lessons in order to record the oral reading miscues. Observation and elicitation procedures continued once or twice weekly from January to

June 1983. Reading miscues and teacher responses were recorded manually and on audiotape. Recording sheets contained the text of the material read during each session or the actual text was used. After the session, the text was copied and transferred to a recording sheet. The tape recordings were used to double check the miscues and responses. Subsequently, the data were analyzed to determine the miscue rate and the types of miscues. The instructional program and materials could not be controlled. They were selected by the participating teachers as representative of the school reading programs and classroom materials.

Teacher Selection

Two teachers volunteered to participate in the study. They met the following criteria:

(a) Willingness of the school administrator to have them participate in the study;

(b) Willingness of teachers to participate in the study;

(c) Teachers of children who use nonstandard English to varying degrees;

(d) A difference in their knowledge of Black English as demonstrated by their scores on the Test of Black English for Teachers of Bidialectal Students (TBETB).

A conference was held with each teacher to determine when each class would be observed and to arrange for the administration of the sentence repetition task. Each teacher supplied a class roster and time schedule.

The participating teachers were both Black women. They each have approximately ten years of experience, were in their mid-thirties, and

have husbands and children. Each taught in a class in the South Bronx and did not live in the community. Both teachers are regularly appointed, tenured teachers having passed an oral and written examination given by the New York City Board of Education

School Selection

Schools were selected on the basis of Principal permission and the presence in those schools of teachers who were amenable to participating in the study. Although both schools were located in poverty areas in the South Bronx, the administration of the buildings and the condition of the physical plants differed greatly. School One had approximately 600 children, whereas School Two was very large and had a population of almost 1,200 children. At School One, there were rarely children in the halls, floors were spotlessly clean, and corridors were decorated with pupils' work. At School Two, however, children were often encountered on the stairs, and in the halls; litter was strewn in the halls, classrooms, and staircases, as well as in front of the building. Both schools are recipients of Chapter 1 funds which indicates a low socioeconomic level and achievement levels that are considerably lower than the norm, thus making them eligible for government assistance.

Pupil Selection

A target group of children who spoke nonstandard English was to be selected. However, testing disclosed that all the pupils in the class

spoke nonstandard English to varying degrees. In addition, the reading groups in the class consisted of all ranges of nonstandard speakers making it impossible to isolate groups of children according to the extent of nonstandard use. Therefore, each entire class was included and observed by reading group or as a whole depending on the format of the particular reading lesson.

The two classes were second grade level and the children were approximately seven years old. The children used nonstandard English to varying degrees. Teacher One had 32 children. There were 15 Black, 16 Hispanic and 1 White child. There were 15 boys and 17 girls. Teacher Two had 32 children. There were 25 Black and 7 Hispanic children. There were 12 boys and 20 girls. The Hispanic children were identified by their Hispanic surnames and were asked whether Spanish was spoken in their homes. The purpose of this was to ascertain whether the surname did indicate that another language was involved besides English.

All of the children were considered in satisfactory health and there was no evidence of handicapping conditions. During the course of six months, there were the usual absences due to common colds and children's diseases such as chicken pox. The problems of poverty appear to have contributed to their absence because of lack of heat and/or hot water and proper clothing for school or the weather. These problems were more evident in Class Two than in Class One. In addition, each class contained several children who needed extra attention from the teacher and were, at times, disruptive to the learning environment. Both teachers, because they were respected for their abilities to

establish rapport with children who have difficulties in the school environment, had two to three children in their classes who fitted that description, in addition to at least one who attended unofficially at the Principal's request.

Instruments

Tests of Black English for Teachers of Bidialectal Students (TBETB). The Tests of Black English for Teachers of Bidialectal Students (referred to hereafter as the TBETB) were administered individually to (1) establish the extent of teacher knowledge of the phonological, grammatical, lexical, and stylistic features of (American) Black English speech varieties; and (2) measure the knowledge of behaviors associated with the successful teaching of reading and other language arts skills to children who speak Black English (Test #2 is Language Arts Pedagogy). Approximately forty minutes were needed for completion of both tests. The tests have been modified by deleting some items and substituting others from Form B for those in Form A (Appendix A).

No level of passing or failing the tests was established. The test was used to determine the extent of knowledge in relative terms for purposes of comparison. The revised Form A (Part I: History and Structure of Black [American] English) includes forty questions; and Form A (Part II: Language Arts Pedagogy) includes twenty, for a total of sixty responses. A teacher scoring in the lower third and another in the upper third were to be considered as sufficiently different in their

knowledge of Black English and Language Arts Pedagogy. This procedure was modified since an item analysis revealed differences in teacher responses to questions within the categories. An analysis of test items used resulted in the categories presented in Table 1.

This test was used as an example of one form of nonstandard English. Since the extent of Black English usage varies in the Black population, all Black children were not expected to have all features present in their speech. This same variability existed in the nonstandard speech of the other children in both classes. Their speech, also, included forms characteristic of American Black English. This test measured knowledge of structure and language arts pedagogy and attitude about Black English. It is the best known form of nonstandard speech and extensive descriptions and analysis have been written about it. The assumption was made that knowledge of and attitude toward Black English would be a good barometer to use for nonstandard speech generally and to measure differences in knowledge and attitude of the teachers in this study.

Sentence Repetition Task. To a large extent, the degree to which individuals will use dialect is determined by the social context in which they find themselves and also by their own ability to code switch (communicative competence). The school situation is a setting in which standard English is expected and reinforced. A sentence repetition task which requires individuals to repeat standard English sentences can provide a language profile of the forms children habitually use. Sentence repetition tasks assess children's ability to produce certain

TABLE 1

TESTS OF BLACK ENGLISH FOR TEACHERS OF
BIDIALECTAL STUDENTS (TBETB)
TEST ITEM CATEGORIES

TBETB	QUESTIONS
Part I: History and Structure	
Attitudes	7, 8, 34
History and Culture	1, 2, 4-8, 33, 35
Structure	3, 9-32, 34
Stylistics	35-40
Part II: Language Arts Pedagogy	
Language and Learning	1, 2, 4, 5, 12
Methodology	7-11, 13, 15-20
Attitudes	3, 4, 6, 12, 14

grammatical and phonological features and their need to translate standard forms into their own dialect. Hence, as a means of identifying children who speak nonstandard forms of English, a sentence repetition task was administered to each child.

An instrument developed by Piestrup (1973) containing fifty potential forms of Black English embedded in standard English sentences was used. The sentences included phonological and grammatical forms but not intonational forms. To these were added three additional sentences from a repetition task constructed by Baratz (1968). This expanded the variety and complexity of the Black English forms which a child could substitute for the standard English forms. The total number of potential forms to be scored was 64; 50 from the Piestrup (1973) task and 14 from Baratz (1968).

Initially, in order to hold the potential dialect forms constant, only those 64 forms were to be counted (Appendix B). However, as the task was administered to the children, this procedure was found to be too limiting. The children used a wide range of nonstandard forms not represented in the projected possibilities. Therefore, instead of counting each Black English substitution as identified by either Piestrup or Baratz, all omissions and substitutions were recorded and analyzed. They were categorized and summarized for each child as illustrated in Table 2. This information was used to classify each child, according to the extent of nonstandard English used.

The instrument was administered by taping the standard English sentences and allowing intervals for repetition of the sentence by the

TABLE 2

TALLY SHEET FOR ANALYSIS OF NONSTANDARD ENGLISH REPETITION TASK FOR EACH CHILD

1. Variations in Phonology

    a. Final consonants (reduced or weakened)
    b. Consonant clusters simplified
    c. /th/ changed to /t, d, f, v/
    d. Vowels modified
    e. /l/ deleted

2. Variations in Morphology

    a. Plural
    b. Third person singular present
    c. Irregular verb classes
    d. Past tense
    e. Patterns-habitual action
    f. Future markers
    g. Auxiliary verbs

3. Variation in Syntax

4. Pronoun Variations

child. A second tape recorder was used to record each child's repetitions. The task was performed individually, outside the classroom in a quiet, private place by the researcher. Prior to testing each child, the examiner attempted to put each child at ease by a sixty-second general conversation period. All children were permitted to perform the task and were allowed to listen to their own voice. This avoided singling out a particular racial or ethnic group and also provided for a range of nonstandard English speakers.

The children's use of nonstandard English was rated by two experts knowledgeable about nonstandard speech. The raters were both professors at the University of Massachusetts in Amherst. One is a Professor of Communication Disorders and the other of Developmental Psychology; both with knowledge and expertise in the study of Black English. The raters were given copies of each child's responses to the sentence repetition task and also the summary test. Based on this information (the substitutions and omissions), the raters independently made a gross measure of each child's level of nonstandard use and classified them as strong, mild, or weak. The criteria for classifying the children had been discussed prior to the actual rating sessions. They were the following: Children who used both phonological and grammatical features of nonstandard English were rated as strong. The pupils who used some of either of these were rated as mild, and those whose speech had very few phonological or grammatical features were designated as weak. Each rater independently classified all of the children according to that criteria. This was followed by comparing classifications for agreement.

Each child was discussed. In cases where there was disagreement, the rater who had classified the individual in the stronger category assumed the responsibility for justifying his rating. The raters continued to discuss the case until consensual agreement was reached. There was approximately 90 percent agreement initially and 100 percent agreement after discussion. Disagreements were never between the extreme categories weak and strong, but rather weak and mild or mild and strong.

Informal Reading Inventory

As second graders, these children had not been tested previously. Teacher estimate was the only source of information regarding reading achievement. Therefore, an informal reading inventory was administered to each child individually. Oral reading paragraphs from J. P. Olson, and M. H. Dillner (1976) were used. Since the children were in the second grade and were reported to be below level in reading, they read orally starting at the pre-primer level to ensure success. This was followed by silent reading of a different paragraph at each level. A series of comprehension questions was asked after each paragraph. Based on the oral and silent reading and the responses to the comprehension questions, the following reading levels were established: (1) independent level; (2) instructional level; and (3) frustration level.

Standardized test. In April, 1983, the children were tested, formally, with the California Achievement Test. The tests were mechanically scored. This followed New York City Board of Education procedure. The scores were available in June, 1983.

Classroom Observation

Oral reading. Children were observed during the usual reading session using the regular instructional materials and procedures. The researcher hand recorded pupil miscues and teacher responses on the observation recording sheet found in Appendix C. The sessions were audiotaped as well.

The observation recording sheets contained the text of the material to be read that day. As each pupil read orally, the researcher identified the pupil reading and recorded the miscues and teacher responses to the miscues. Self corrections or corrections by other children were also recorded.

Oral Reading Observational System. After each oral reading session, the Oral Reading Observational System (Roberts, 1973) was used to code reader and teacher behavior. It consists of twenty-seven categories of behavior: fifteen categories of teacher behavior and one for other pupil behavior. It was designed to record interaction between pupil and teacher rather than the group or class as a whole. Both verbal and nonverbal behavior were recorded. Since equivalents of verbal and nonverbal behavior are recorded with the same code, solely nonverbal behavior was circled.

The coding procedure to be followed involved:

1. Analyzing the reading miscues and assigning the appropriate code. Table 3 outlines the pupil

TABLE 3

BEHAVIORAL CATEGORIES OF THE ORAL READING OBSERVATIONAL SYSTEM

GENERAL CATEGORY	CODE	SPECIFIC CATEGORY
Reader Behavioral Categories		
Reading Response Errors	01	Incomplete Responses
	04	Substitution
	05	Omission
	06	Addition
	07	Scramble
Nonreading Response Errors	31	Nonverbal Scanning
	02	Requests Help
	03	Waiting
Teacher Behavioral Categories		
Corrects	11	Supplies Corrections
	12	Calls on Another Child to Correct
Provides Feedback	13	Positive Feedback
	14	Negative Feedback
	15	Error Feedback
	16	Constructive Feedback
Provides Cues	17	Provides Decoding Cue
	18	Provides Contextual Cue
Suggests Strategy	19	Suggests Decoding Strategy
	20	Suggests Contextual Strategy
	21	Suggests Re-Read
	22	Suggests Read Ahead
Others	23	Waiting or Delayed Response
	24	No Response
	25	Other
Other Pupil Behavioral Category		
Corrects	26	Spontaneously Supplies Correction

behaviors and teacher responses with the corresponding code numbers.

2. Each of the pupil's miscues and each of the teacher responses were assigned a code from the Oral Reading Observational System included in Appendix D. The Oral Reading Observational Coding Sheet in Appendix E was used to record the sequence of pupils' miscues and teacher responses which comprise the miscue episodes.
3. All of the coded data were transferred onto IBM data sheets for key punching.

In order to differentiate between reading miscues and nonstandard English reading miscues, the first digit of the two-digit code was changed to "3" (e.g., 05 became 35) for nonstandard English miscues. During the recording, verbal and nonverbal behavior were represented by the same code, except nonverbal behavior was circled. Since a circle cannot be key punched, the first digit of the circled two-digit code was to be changed to "5" for all pupil nonverbal behaviors (e.g., 02 became 52) and changed to "7" for all nonverbal teacher behaviors (e.g., 14 became 74). Methodologically, however, it proved impractical to record the teachers' nonverbal responses because monitoring the audio tape recorder and recording the pupil's oral reading miscues and the teachers' responses were all that was manageable.

Data analysis. Following are the variables in this research.

Pupil Behaviors

Incomplete Response
Substitutions
Omissions
Additions
Scramble
Nonverbal Scanning
Requests Help
Waiting
Repeated Correction
Self Correction

Teacher Responses

Other Expression
Other Shows Child the Place
Teacher Supplies Correction
Teacher Calls Another Child to Correct
Positive Feedback
Negative Feedback
Error Feedback
Constructive Feedback
Decoding Cue
Contextual Cue
Decoding Strategy
Contextual Strategy
Re-Read
Waiting or Delayed Response
No Response
Other
Other Child Spontaneously Corrects

Language Related Child Behaviors

Substitution -- Nonstandard English
Omission -- Nonstandard English
Addition -- Nonstandard English
Repeated Correction -- Nonstandard English

Teacher

Less Knowledge of Nonstandard English
Greater Knowledge of Nonstandard English

Language Levels

Strong
Mild
Weak

Reading Groups

Slower
Faster

The following statistical procedures were used in order to address the research questions: Pearson Correlation Coefficient and Analysis of Variance.

Limitations of the Study

This exploratory study was intended to provide descriptive data which would raise questions leading toward further experimental and theoretical research. In analyzing the findings, it is important that the following limitations be considered:

1. Choice of participating schools and teachers was limited to those that were willing to do so. The fact that these individuals volunteered may be an intervening factor in the kind of data collected.
2. The TBETB did not measure precisely the knowledge and attitudes of teachers toward American Black English, but provided an approximation of the relative information possessed and the feelings of each teacher toward American Black English. It is the most prevalent form of nonstandard English and the

form about which there is the most documentation and research. Therefore, it was used as representative of nonstandard English and the assumption was made that teachers' knowledge and attitude about Black English would be an indication of their knowledge and attitudes of nonstandard forms of English, generally.

3. The sentence repetition task used to categorize the pupils' extent of Black English use was a gross measure which did not define precise categories of ability but did distinguish between strong, mild, and weak nonstandard English productions.
4. Two teachers and their respective classes is a small sample. Generalizability of findings is therefore limited. Research findings will suggest areas for further study.

During the study, the following situations developed which further limit its generalizability:

1. Reading in the classrooms was limited to one forty-minute period a day or less. Frequent classroom interruptions and changes in schedules altered the schedule and sometimes reading either did not occur during that day or was rescheduled for a time during which the researcher could not be present.
2. The tape recorder frequently picked up ambient noises which made the children's readings less intelligible

when played back. In addition, it was difficult to hear the children while they were reading because of the noise level in the classroom.

3. Since the major effort was placed on hearing the children's oral reading, it proved impractical to record the teacher's nonverbal responses to oral reading miscues.
4. In Classroom 2, pupils' attendance was poor.
5. Teachers' styles, use of reading groups and structured basal reading lessons or other skill lessons were different resulting in different amounts of data available for analysis.
6. Rather than arbitrarily select children for inclusion, each entire class was rated in nonstandard English use within the broad categories listed above. This procedure included Spanish surnamed pupils who were not limited in English proficiency but who were English dominant. Their speech, however, did include varying degrees of nonstandard English and frequently features characterized as Black English.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The results of this study are reported using percentages, means, miscue rates, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient, and Analysis of Variance. Before specific research questions are addressed, overall patterns in the data will be summarized.

Two teachers who differed in their knowledge of Black English were observed interacting with their respective classes during reading instruction. Although reading group instruction, reading materials, and the number of words children read orally differed, the error rates were not significantly different. However, teacher responses differed in rate and kind to pupils' miscues.

Instruments

Test of Black English for Teachers of Bidialectal Students. Two teachers were administered the Test of Black English for Teachers of Bidialectal Students (TBETB). One of the purposes for administering the TBETB was to determine whether the teachers differed in their knowledge and attitudes toward Black English. The assumption was made that there would be difference in knowledge of Black English structure and language arts pedagogy.

The maximum possible score was 60. No level of passing or failing was established. Teacher One, who scored 33, was considered to be in

the median range and Teacher Two in the low-high range (44). Rather than total scores, it was more meaningful to look at how these scores differed internally. Upon analysis, the incorrect items were found to be distributed as shown in Table 4.

In Part I, Teacher One responded incorrectly to almost twice (19) the number of items as Teacher Two (10). These questions are concentrated in the area of structure. Although the questions Teacher Two answered incorrectly are also in that area, for Teacher One they represent 68.4 percent of her total incorrect responses or 32.4 percent of the total possible responses (for Part I), whereas for Teacher Two, it is 60 percent of the total incorrect responses or 15 percent of the total possible questions in Part I. Both teachers responded incorrectly to eight questions in Part II, and these are clustered in the methods section.

Although both teachers did have knowledge and understanding of Black English, Teacher One was considerably weaker in the area of structure of Black English. It is important to note, however, that both teachers were weak in methodology. On the basis of the test questions, neither teacher responded in a way which would indicate a negative attitude. For the purposes of this study, then, the teachers were considered sufficiently different to compare their interactions with children. On the basis of the results, it was expected that Teacher Two should show greater support and provide more effective instruction in reading for children who show more nonstandard English in their speech.

TABLE 4

DISTRIBUTION OF INCORRECT AND CORRECT ITEMS FROM THE TEST OF BLACK ENGLISH FOR TEACHERS OF BIDIALECTAL STUDENTS (TBETB)

	TEACHER ONE		TEACHER TWO	
	CORRECT	INCORRECT	CORRECT	INCORRECT
Part I				
Attitudes		0		1 (8)*
History and Culture		3 (1, 5, 8)*		1 (6)
Structure		13 (9, 10, 13, 21, 23, 26-32, 34)		6 (10, 14, 16, 23, 26, 31)
Stylistics		3 (37, 39, 40)		2 (39, 40)
TOTALS:	21	19	30	10
Part II				
Language and Learning		0		1 (4)
Methodology		7 (7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 19)		5 (7, 8, 10, 13, 16, 17)
Attitude		1 (14)		1 (12)
TOTALS:	12	8	12	8
TOTALS I AND II:	33	27	42	18

*Numbers of incorrect items -- TBETB in Appendix B.

Sentence repetition task. The study population consisted of 58 pupils in two second grade classrooms. Teacher One had 32 children and Teacher Two had 26. The sentence repetition task has been administered to each child separately, with one exception: a child in Teacher One's class was frequently absent. The categories strong, mild, and weak describe the extent to which pupils use nonstandard English.

Table 5 describes the distribution, by teacher, in terms of the extent of nonstandard English used by each child.

Standardized reading test. The California Achievement Test was administered by the classroom teachers, according to New York City Board of Education test procedures, in April, 1983. Table 6 summarizes the results of teacher and nonstandard English category. The mean scores for both teachers indicate that pupils are approximately on or above grade level. Given the low socioeconomic profiles and the presence of Chapter I assistance, it was expected that the children would be further below the norm.

Teacher One was less knowledgeable about Black English. She gave more negative and fewer positive responses to her children's nonstandard English miscues. However, the reading grade equivalent scores indicate a higher achievement level for pupils in Teacher One's class. Since pretest scores were not available, conclusions cannot be drawn, which relate her teaching skills to the pupils' achievement. The pupils may have been reading at a higher level initially; the gain for all children is unknown.

TABLE 5

DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN BY TEACHER ACCORDING TO EXTENT OF NONSTANDARD ENGLISH USE

TEACHER	STRONG	MILD	WEAK	MISSING	TOTAL
One	7	15	9	1	32
Two	4	16	6	0	26
Total:	11	31	15	1	58

TABLE 6

SUMMARY OF READING GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES FOR CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST, APRIL 1983, BY TEACHER AND EXTENT OF NONSTANDARD USE

READING GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES	EXTENT OF NONSTANDARD USE BY TEACHER							
	TEACHER ONE				TEACHER TWO			
	1 STRONG	2 MILD	3 WEAK	TOTAL	1 STRONG	2 MILD	3 WEAK	TOTAL
Number	7	15	9	31	4	16	6	26
Range	2.5-4.7	2.1-5.8	1.9-4.4	1.9-5.2	2.3-2.8	1.3-4.7	1.9-3.9	1.3-4.7
Mean	3.49	3.77	3.24	3.53	2.6	2.76	3.95	3.3
Median	3.3	3.3	3.7	2.60	2.3	2.6	3.0	2.7

Total Means for Categories of Nonstandard Use: Strong = 2.8
Mild = 2.9
Weak = 3.3

Classroom observation. Observations of Teacher One produced a total of 11,467 words read with 1,184 miscues yielding a miscue (error) rate of 10 percent. For Teacher Two, the number of words read was one-third as many as Teacher One; however, the miscue rate (9 percent) was comparable. Analysis of variance indicated that the difference in miscue rate between teachers was not significant (Tables 7 and 8).

Teachers respond differently to oral reading miscues. Ways of responding which are considered positive, signal to children that the teacher has confidence in their ability to read, that is, to figure out an unknown word or a miscue. The teacher shows confidence in the children's ability by (1) allowing the children to control their reading by "not responding" to their miscues and "not supplying the correction or word"; (2) teachers may also give informative, instructional input which provide, for example, "decoding or contextual cues and strategies," but still allows the children independence in the decoding process; (3) teachers can use positive feedback, such as nods, smiles and compliments, which encourage the children to continue.

Alternatively, there are teacher responses that have negative connotations. Previous data suggest that "supplying corrections" and "error responses," such as "No" or "That's wrong," are associated with teachers' behaviors toward poorer readers. Negative feedback has a similar effect on pupils.

Table 9 summarizes the teachers' negative and positive responses to pupils' miscues generally and to nonstandard English miscues. Teacher One has more negative responses and fewer positive responses

TABLE 7

SUMMARY OF TOTAL WORDS READ, MISCUES AND MISCUE RATE FOR EACH TEACHER

N=58	SCHOOL	TOTAL WORDS READ	TOTAL NUMBER MISCUES	MISCUE RATE
32	1	11,467	1,184	.103
26	2	3,847	351	.091

TABLE 8

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE MISCUE RATE

	SUM OF SQUARES	DEGREE OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE
Between Groups	.0011	1	.0011
Within Groups	.1663	56	.0030
TOTAL:	.1674	57	

F = .3753

Sig. = .5426

P = < .05

TABLE 9

SUMMARY OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE RESPONSES TO PUPILS' MISCUES AND NONSTANDARD ENGLISH MISCUES

	TEACHER ONE		TEACHER TWO	
	STANDARD ENGLISH	NONSTANDARD ENGLISH	STANDARD ENGLISH	NONSTANDARD ENGLISH
	N = 691	N = 177	N = 417	N = 65
Positive Behaviors				
Allowing pupil to control the reading process--implying confidence				
Re-Read	.00	.00	.05	.02
Expression	.05	.00	.00	.00
Providing instructional input to allow children to maintain control of reading process (decoding and contextual cues and strategies)	.04	.02	.22	.00
Constructive feedback	.01		.01	
Positive feedback	.04	—	.15	.05
TOTAL POSITIVE BEHAVIORS:	.14	.02	.43	.07
Negative Behaviors				
Supplying corrections	.39	.03	.25	.02
Error feedback	.02	.00	.04	.02
Negative feedback	.00	—	.00	—
TOTAL NEGATIVE BEHAVIORS:	.41	.03	.29	.04
No Response	.40	.95	.25	.91
Calls Another Child	.01		.00	
Finding Place	.01		.00	

Totals less than 1.0 are due to rounding off to nearest hundredth.

than Teacher Two for both standard and nonstandard English miscues. Teacher One also was less knowledgeable about Black English as measured by the TBETB.

Discussion of teacher responses are organized around the questions posed in Chapter I.

Research Questions

Questions 1 and 2: What is the pattern and frequency of teacher responses to the various types of reading miscues? The most frequently occurring response by the teachers to pupil behavior was a "no response." Of the total teacher responses including both classes, 35 percent were of the "no response" classification. With Teacher One, they occurred 40 percent of the time, and 5 percent with Teacher Two. These responses are difficult to interpret. They could mean teachers were preoccupied or distracted, or it may reflect teachers' confidence that the readers would self correct their miscues. It may also mean the miscue is semantically or syntactically acceptable to the context of the sentence.

The next most frequent response was "teacher supplies correction" which was 34 percent of the total number of responses. As separate entities, the occurrence by each teacher was 39 percent and 25 percent, respectively, for Teachers One and Two.

Teacher Two used "decoding cues and strategies" 17 percent and 5 percent of the time, respectively. Of the total responses, 15 percent were "positive reinforcement (feedback)" and 1 percent was "constructive feedback."

Teacher One gave considerably fewer responses that were classified as "decoding cues and strategies" (2 percent each). "Positive and constructive feedback" were provided 4 percent and 1 percent of the time. Teacher One, however, did give more feedback in terms of correction in "reading with expression" (5 percent) [Tables 9 and 10]. Therefore, as predicted, Teacher Two, who shows more knowledge of Black English, responded more directly to students' miscues (gave fewer "no response"), and gave more positive feedback and more instructional support to the students (decoding and contextual cueing and strategies). Teacher One showed some concern for language by encouraging students to read with more expression.

Question 3: Does the number of oral reading miscues vary as a function of the degree of nonstandard use? What percentage of miscues are nonstandard English miscues? Of the total miscues, 19 percent were due to nonstandard English forms (Table 11). The overall nonstandard English miscue rate was the same for all three language categories (.02). Three language categories were used to describe the extent of nonstandard English used by each child. They were: (1) strong, (2) mild, and (3) weak. Categories strong and mild had similar miscue (error) rates (.073 and .065, respectively), whereas the weak category had more than twice the miscue rate of the other two (.153). These differences were found to be insignificant ($F = 2.613$; $p < .08$). However, the percent of total miscues which had nonstandard English features were also similar for the strong and mild categories (22 percent and 25 percent, respectively). The weak category was approximately 11 percent. Thus,

TABLE 10

SUMMARY OF TOTAL RESPONSES BY TEACHERS INCLUDING THE TOTAL FREQUENCY, MEAN AND PERCENT OF TOTAL RESPONSES

	TOTAL FREQUENCY			MEAN			PERCENT OF TOTAL RESPONSES*		
	TEACHER ONE	TEACHER TWO	TOTAL	TEACHER ONE	TEACHER TWO	TOTAL	TEACHER ONE	TEACHER TWO	TOTAL
N	691	417	1108						
No Response	279	105	384	8.719	4.038	6.621	.40	.25	.35
Teacher Supplies Correction	272	103	375	8.500	3.962	6.466	.39	.25	.34
Positive Feedback	29	61	90	.906	2.346	1.552	.04	.15	.08
Decoding Cue	13	72	85	.406	2.769	1.466	.02	.17	.08
Decoding Strategy	14	22	36	.438	.846	.6211	.02	.05	.03
Error Feedback	17	18	35	.531	.692	.603	.02	.04	.03
Other Expression	35	00	35	1.094	.000	.603	.05	.00	.03
Re-Read	3	20	23	.094	.769	.397	.00	.05	.02
Constructive Feedback	6	6	12	.188	.231	.207	.01	.01	.01
Teacher Calls Another Child	8	3	11	.250	.115	.190	.01	.01	.01
Other/Place	9	0	9	.281	.000	.155	.01	.00	.01
Contextual Cue	3	5	8	.094	.192	.138	.00	.01	.01
Contextual Strategy	2	1	3	.063	.038	.052	.00	.00	.00
Negative Feedback	1	1	2	.031	.038	.034	.00	.00	.00

*Totals less than 1.0 are due to rounding off to the nearest hundredth.

TABLE 11

DISTRIBUTION OF READING MISCUES INCLUDING NONSTANDARD ENGLISH
BY LANGUAGE CATEGORIES: STRONG (1), MILD (2), OR WEAK (3)

	STRONG (1)	MILD (2)	WEAK (3)	TOTAL NSE* MISCUES	RATE OF TOTAL WHICH ARE NSE*
Language Category N	11	31	15		
Total Reading Miscues	311	467	530		
Mean	28.27	15.06	35.33		
NSE Miscues - Substitutions	45	64	34	143	.11
Mean	4.1	2.1	2.3	2.51	
NSE Miscues - Omissions	20	48	21	89	.07
Mean	1.8	1.5	1.4	1.56	
NSE Miscues - Additions	2	7	1	10	.01
Mean	.02	.2	.07	.18	
Total NSE Miscues -	67	119	56	242	
Mean	6.1	3.8	3.7	4.25	
NSE Miscue (Error) Rate	.02	.02	.02		
Miscue (Error) Rate	.073	.065	.153		
Percent of Miscues Which Are NSE	.22	.25	.11		.19

*Nonstandard English

the weak category produced half as many nonstandard English miscues as the strong category, but twice as many miscues generally. Comparatively fewer of their miscues are related to nonstandard English use, although they produce more miscues generally. Pupils with the strongest use of nonstandard English produced the greatest amount ($\bar{x}$ = 6.1) of nonstandard English reading miscues. Those children with the weakest use of nonstandard use had the least ($\bar{x}$ = 3.7) [Table 11].

These results suggest that pupils designated as weak in their use of nonstandard English are taking more risks during reading and therefore have more miscues. This willingness to try to decode and read when they are not certain of the words may be based on feeling more comfortable with standard English and therefore willing to try to predict from what they know how to read, to what they think is written in the text. Therefore, the "weak" category produces twice as many miscues as the "strong" category, but half as many nonstandard. This is reflective of their usual speech which has the fewest nonstandard features.

Of the nonstandard English miscues, substitutions accounted for 59 percent and omission almost 40 percent. Less than 1 percent were additions (Table 11). Teacher One's children produced 76 percent of the substitutions, 71 percent of the omissions, and 60 percent of the additions. The data showed that the difference between teachers in nonstandard substitutions (Table 12) and omissions (Table 13) is significant ($p = < .05$).

TABLE 12

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SUBSTITUTION (NONSTANDARD ENGLISH)
MISCUES--BETWEEN TEACHERS

	SUM OF SQUARES	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE
Between Groups	59.6074	1	59.6074
Within Groups	560.4615	56	10.0082
Total:	620.0690	57	

F = 5.9558

Sig. = .0179

TABLE 13

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF OMISSION (NONSTANDARD ENGLISH)
MISCUES--BETWEEN TEACHERS

	SUM OF SQUARES	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	MEAN SQUARE
Between Groups	11.5945	1	11.5945
Within Groups	136.8365	56	2.4435
Total:	148.4310	57	

F = 4.7450

Sig. = .0336

Question 4: What is the pattern of teachers' responses to pupils' oral reading miscues and how is it related to nonstandard use of English generally and relative to the extent of dialect use? Table 9 summarizes the responses by Teachers One and Two to selected categories of miscues generally and in response to nonstandard English miscues.

For both teachers, the percent of use of "no response" increased for nonstandard English miscues. Teacher One used a "no response" to all miscues 40 percent of the time and 95 percent to nonstandard English miscues. Teacher Two responded with "no response" 25 percent of the time and 91 percent to nonstandard English miscues. Although Teacher One "supplied corrections" at a rate of 39 percent, only 3 percent were to nonstandard English miscues and Teacher Two responded by "supplying corrections" 25 percent of the time, only 2 percent were to nonstandard miscues. The overwhelming response by both teachers to nonstandard English miscues was "no response" (Table 9). These findings are supported by statistical analysis using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient. It showed a significant relationship exists between "no response" behaviors of Teachers One and Two and children's nonstandard English substitutions, omissions and additions. This was also evident for their use of "supplying correction." Although computed on a small data base, the analysis suggested that differences in responses did exist between teachers. Teacher Two responded significantly more positively to substitutions by giving "constructive feedback," "decoding cues," and suggesting the child "re-read." Teacher Two also provided "decoding strategies" for nonstandard English additions.

Negative response strategies were implied by Teacher Two "supplying corrections" and "error feedback" (indicating only that an error had occurred). However, Teacher Two appeared to use a wider range of responses.

Teacher One, on the other hand, provided "negative feedback" and in response to nonstandard English additions gave "error feedback." Other responses were suggestions that the child "re-read" and "read with expression" when the children's use of nonstandard forms occurred during a repeated corrected.

Both teachers behaved differentially toward pupils depending on the extent of nonstandard English use. When nonstandard English substitutions occurred, Teacher One showed a positive relationship with all three language categories for "no response" and "reading with expression." In addition, Teacher One responded to strong use of nonstandard English with "decoding strategies." By contrast, Teacher Two responded by "supplying corrections," "providing context cues and strategies," "giving error feedback," and "suggesting the children re-read." A "no response" is given to the strong category, as well. However, Teacher Two provided a wider range of responses to children who are in the strong category of nonstandard English use. By contrast, Teacher One used the widest range of responses with the weak category: "suggesting the child read with expression," "constructive feedback," and "calling on another child to correct" (Table 14).

Teacher One was less knowledgeable about Black English structure as measured by the TBETB and used as an indicator of her knowledge of

TABLE 14

SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS OF CORRELATIONS OF PUPILS' NONSTANDARD ENGLISH MISCUES AND TEACHER RESPONSES

TEACHER RESPONSES	NSE* SUBSTITUTION TEACHER ONE	NSE* SUBSTITUTION TEACHER TWO	TOTAL	NSE* OMISSION TEACHER ONE	NSE* OMISSION TEACHER TWO	TOTAL	NSE* ADDITION TEACHER ONE	NSE* ADDITION TEACHER TWO	TOTAL	NSE* REPEAT CORRECTION TEACHER ONE	NSE* REPEAT CORRECTION TEACHER TWO	TOTAL
No Response	.001	.001	.001	.001		.001	.001	.002				
Teacher Supplies Correction	.010	.011	.001		.014				.050			
Error								.048	.015	.001		.004
Constructive		.006	.038						.043			
Negative							.001		.001			
Re-Read		.007								.001		
Decoding Strategy			.026					.038				
Contextual Strategy						.017						
Decoding Cues		.007										
Expression	.001											

*Nonstandard English

TABLE 15

SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS OF CORRELATIONS OF NONSTANDARD ENGLISH MISCUES (BY TEACHER AND LANGUAGE CATEGORIES) AND TEACHER BEHAVIORS

	NSE* SUBSTITUTIONS						NSE* OMISSIONS						NSE* ADDITIONS					
	TEACHER ONE			TEACHER TWO			TEACHER ONE			TEACHER TWO			TEACHER ONE			TEACHER TWO		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Expressions	.029	.027	.026						.028									
Place																		
Supplies Correction						.013				.002						.002		
Calls Child to Correct		.026	.004															.021
Positive Feedback					.005													
Negative Feedback																		
Error Feedback			.019						.022	.010						.010		
Constructive			.001						.005	·								
Decoding Cue																		
Contextual Strategy																.001		
Re-Read			.001						.005	.015		.029				.015		
No Response	.009	.003	.001		.032			.023	.002	.002	.026					.002	.050	
Other		.001																
Contextual Cue										.001						.001		
Decoding Strategy	.006																	

*Nonstandard English
1 = Strong
2 = Mild
3 = Weak

nonstandard forms of English. Her lack of and limited response to nonstandard English miscues to the strong category may be a reflection of her inability to recognize nonstandard English miscues and to respond with an effective teaching strategy, although it is possible that it was the result of sensitivity to the language and therefore was the acceptance of semantically and syntactically appropriate miscues. Records were not kept of the semantic and syntactic appropriateness of miscues; therefore, this possibility cannot be explored nor commented on.

Question 5: How is the pattern of teachers' responses to nonstandard English used during reading related to their knowledge of and attitude toward Black English? Based on analysis of questions (TBETB), Teacher One answered incorrectly and was less knowledgeable about structure of Black English. Both teachers were weak in their knowledge of language arts strategies for teaching pupils who use Black English. The test results did not indicate a negative attitude toward Black English for either teacher. Teacher Two was expected, therefore, to provide more effective instruction and to be more supportive during reading instruction. The data showed that in response to nonstandard English miscues, Teacher Two provided a wider range of responses than Teacher One. These included more "positive and constructive responses," "decoding cues and strategies," but also "negative and error feedback." Teacher One, on the other hand, responded almost exclusively with "no response" to nonstandard English miscues.

The teachers also responded differentially to the extent of dialect used, whether strong, mild, or weak. Teacher One generally responded to all three language categories by a "no response" to nonstandard English miscues. However, when other responses occurred, they were to the weak category. By contrast, Teacher Two used the widest range of responses with the strong category.

In response to nonstandard English miscues, both teachers used "no response" to a much greater extent than to other miscues. For miscues generally, Teacher One responded with "no response" at a rate of 40 percent. This increased to 95 percent for nonstandard miscues. For Teacher Two, the increase was from 5 percent to 91 percent. Teacher one "supplied corrections" at a rate of 39 percent for miscues generally, but only 3 percent for nonstandard miscues. For Teacher Two, the rate decreased from 25 percent to 2 percent.

Teachers One and Two each had a limited repertoire of responses to nonstandard English miscues. Their responses differed from responses to other miscues. They also responded differently to pupils' use of nonstandard English; Teacher One responding more positively to the weak category and Teacher Two responding more positively to the strong category.

Classroom Procedures

The teachers differed in their approach to reading instruction and the materials they used. Teacher One used a structured basal reading approach. By December, the class had been grouped and routinized so

that after receiving instructions from the teacher, reading groups functioned in an orderly, independent manner. With several reminders from the teachers, they were able to sustain this independent, self-directed activity for about one-half hour. They never became disruptive and at the end of that time most of the assigned work was completed. Each reading group usually read with their teacher for about one-half hour each day.

Teacher Two, by contrast, believed in more intensive instruction in phonics and structural analysis before beginning a basal reading program. Therefore, by December, children had had very little experience working in groups, independently. When they did, it was very noisy and not productive. With the exception of three or four children, the group working independently rarely completed its assignments. This was true for both groups. When either group was not under the direct supervision of Teacher Two, they did not stick with the task and complete it. After a month or two, this condition improved; however, a regular routinized program was never established. Prior to the city-wide reading examination, intensive practice was used to prepare the children for it. This was evident in both classes; but with Teacher Two, this practice took the place of reading instruction, whereas with Teacher One, it was in addition to the regular basal reading program.

Since Teacher Two did not have a regularly scheduled basal reading program, the groups met sporadically, noisily and, for the most part, unsuccessfully. Consequently, the children did not read at length for any extensive period of time. Oral reading consisted mainly of

boardwork, practice exercises in skillbooks and teacher-prepared practice sheets.

Both teachers had warm, affectionate relationships with their pupils, although Teacher One was more formal. Both teachers set high achievement standards and behavioral standards for their classes. The expectation level of Teacher One was higher than Teacher Two. Teacher Two frequently expressed lack of confidence in their ability to score on grade level or above on the standardized test.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The major premise of this study was that teachers' lack of knowledge and negative attitude about nonstandard language forms has contributed to the use of instructional techniques which foster misunderstandings between teachers and pupils and disrupts the learning process. Secondly, negative attitudes and responses to the children's use of nonstandard English contribute more to failure in learning to read than interferences from the dialect itself. This research, therefore, focused on teacher/pupil classroom interaction during reading instruction. The results, as described in the previous chapter, answered research questions posed in this study. A discussion and summary of these results follows.

The most frequently occurring response by teachers to pupils' miscues was a "no response" (Table 10). A "no response" by the teacher to a reading miscue can be interpreted in various ways. It may be that the teacher was unaware that there had been a miscue or that the miscue is semantically correct and therefore the teacher is accepting it in lieu of the text. In order to recognize nonstandard language miscues which fall into that category, the teacher needs to know about language difference and features of particular dialects. This knowledge would help him/her to determine whether a miscue is the result of language difference and to decide on the appropriate response to the miscue.

In this study, statistical analysis for miscues in general indicate there is a significant difference in the occurrence of the "no response" response between the two teachers. This may have been due to differences in the reading materials. With Teacher One, the children read primarily from basal readers. With Teacher Two, the children read from practice sheets and workbooks. With the latter, the emphasis was on decoding and children used phonics and structural strategies to a greater extent than did the former. With Teacher One, there may have been a greater occurrence of "no response" because the miscues did not affect the understanding of the material read.

"No response" occurred in response to nonstandard English miscues at a rate of 95 percent for Teacher One and 91 percent for Teacher Two. Teacher One also responded differently to the children in the three language categories. Children designated as strong (1) nonstandard English users received a "no response" at a rate of 13.14 percent whereas categories mild (2) and weak (3) were 7.93 percent and 6.22 percent, respectively. The differences between responses to language categories were also significant ($F = 3.873$; $p < .027$) [Appendix F]. A "no response" can be interpreted as a positive response since it allows the children to decode or accept a response which is not exact but semantically or syntactically appropriate. In that respect, the responses of Teacher One may be considered more positive. However, data concerning semantic and syntactic appropriateness were not available to make those determinations.

Teacher One also showed less knowledge of Black English on the TBETB. Her lack of response to nonstandard English miscues more likely

reflects her lack of knowledge of Black English features or knowledge of how to provide instruction for children who use nonstandard forms during reading instruction.

The next most frequently occurring response was the "teacher supplying corrections." The difference between teachers was significant ($F = 7.0261$; $p < .01$). Use of this response may be caused by several factors. The teacher may not know how to provide cues and strategies to help the child decode a word; the teacher may lack confidence in the child's ability to decode; or the teacher may feel that decoding strategies should be taught apart from the oral reading time. She may also feel that attempting to help the child decode the word would negatively affect comprehension. It is also possible that the teacher provided assistance, but the pupil did not know how to use the strategy or cue to decode the word. However, if reading is to be improved, it is important to understand the dynamics of this interaction. Supplying the correction takes the responsibility for the reading act from the reader and does not help to develop independence in reading.

The two teachers who participated in this study scored in the median (Teacher One) and low-high (Teacher Two) range on the TBETB. However, item analysis showed each was especially weak in the area of structure and methodology, although Teacher Two was the stronger of the two. These areas are crucial to a teacher's understanding of how Black English differs from standard English and the techniques which are effective in teaching children who speak a nonstandard dialect. Data

seem to indicate that the teachers' lack of knowledge about nonstandard English structure and pedagogy was a factor in their responses to pupils' nonstandard English miscues. They responded differently toward the children with various amounts of nonstandard English in their oral reading. Teacher One who was less knowledgeable responded more positively toward the weak category and Teacher Two who was more knowledgeable responded more positively toward the children who were categorized as strong users of nonstandard English.

Nonstandard English miscues were responded to by "the teacher supplying correction" at a rate of 3 percent by Teacher One and 2 percent by Teacher Two (Table 9). These teacher behaviors are thought to take control of reading away from students and create dependent readers who rely on phonographic cues and who develop into word-by-word readers. Teacher One was less knowledgeable about the structure of Black English. This is reflected in the higher corrective response rate. This is supportive of the notion that teachers' responses are the interfering factor and not the nonstandard use of English.

The percentages of teachers' negative and positive responses, as summarized in Table 9, indicate that Teacher One had fewer positive (nonstandard English, 2 percent; and standard, 14 percent) miscues than Teacher Two (nonstandard, 7 percent; and standard, 43 percent). She also had fewer negative responses for nonstandard miscues (3 percent vs. 4 percent) but more negative responses for standard English miscues (41 percent vs. 29 percent) [Table 9]. Teacher Two responds more positively, overall, to children's reading miscues.

Teacher Two provided more responses specifically related to developing skills in decoding. Teacher Two provided more positive and constructive feedback, but neither teacher responded negatively to reading miscues. On several occasions, the teachers appeared annoyed at children losing their place. It may be that the presence of the researcher and a tape recorder may have discouraged negative responses or that they are generally not used.

The summary of the distribution of nonstandard English reading miscues (see Table 11) showed that the greater the extent of nonstandard English use, the greater the number of nonstandard English miscues. The most frequently occurring were substitution and omission. They represented 14 percent and 9 percent, respectively, of the total miscues overall. Teachers' "no response" to these miscues are correlated positively across all three language categories (strong, mild, and weak). When data are examined teacher by teacher, this was true for Teacher One, but not Teacher Two. For Teacher One, there are more correlations between teacher responses and the weak (Category 3) use of nonstandard English. The teacher appeared to behave differentially during reading instruction toward children from different categories of nonstandard English use. Toward the weak category, there was a wider range of responses. By contrast, Teacher Two exhibited a wider range of behavior which indicate correlations between teacher behavior and childrens' nonstandard English miscues for the strong category. Teacher Two showed a greater knowledge of Black English structure on the TBETB. Her responses to the strong category may reflect that.

There also appears, however, to be a wider range of responses to miscues, in general, than to miscues related to nonstandard English. This may be due to failure to recognize the latter or to lack of knowledge of how to reach reading to children who speak nonstandard English.

The number of oral reading miscues did vary as a function of the degree of nonstandard English used. The children designated as weak had almost twice as many miscues as the children designated as strong and mild. This may have been the result of the children, designated as weak, using more prediction as they read, since they were more familiar with the structure of standard English and able to anticipate sentence structure and content.

Interestingly, the strong category produced the highest rate of language related miscues. Although overall error rate is highest for pupils whose speech most closely approximates standard English, it is lowest for production of nonstandard English miscues. It is important, therefore, that teachers be aware of the proportion of those miscues in pupils with strong dialectal influence, which represent language difference and not lack of reading skills. This knowledge can enable them to make decisions about children's reading capabilities which are more conversant with their reading achievement and not with the extent of their language difference.

Conclusions

Teachers do differ in their responses to pupils' oral reading miscues that contain nonstandard English features. This differential

behavior may be due to lack of knowledge about the nonstandard English forms and to appropriate language arts and reading instructional procedures. Although no overt negative responses were observed, responses such as teacher supplies correction and error feedback can be construed as having a negative impact. Teachers' "no response" to oral reading miscues can be positive in relation to syntactically and semantically appropriate miscues. However, this study does not include information regarding that. The high evidence of the "no response" to nonstandard English miscues may indicate that teachers do not know how to provide instruction for pupils who use nonstandard English and therefore its impact was more negative than positive. Oral reading, if not for pupil assessment, should be an opportunity to provide instruction, therefore more constructive interaction between pupil and teacher should be occurring, i.e., instructional strategies and cues. The high frequency of "teacher supplying correction" can also be interpreted negatively. Teachers are controlling the reading process and not giving the children the opportunity to use what they have learned. This results in dependent readers who have limited ability to use the text as a learning tool.

Although teachers seem to lack knowledge about Black English and understanding of how to respond to its use, it also appears that overall knowledge of reading and the reading process may be lacking as well since the patterns of responses toward both kinds of miscues are so similar and also limited.

Suggestions for Further Research

The findings reported here are based on intensive observations of two second grade teachers and classes over six months. The small number of participants limit the generalizability of the conclusions; however, it does suggest areas of research which can provide further insight into interactive behavior between teachers and children.

The results of this study suggest that important patterns of teacher-pupil behavior are occurring. The small sample of subjects, however, prevented statistical analysis of parts of this study. Further research increasing the numbers of teachers and including those who show greater differences in their knowledge and attitude toward nonstandard English would make the findings more meaningful. The following are suggested areas of further study which would provide useful insights into interaction between teachers and pupils:

1. Differential responses of teachers to pupils with varying degrees of nonstandard English use during reading instruction.
2. The relationship of reading group placement, the extent of nonstandard English use and teacher responses during reading instruction.
3. The "no response" dimension of pupil/teacher interaction which occurred with greatest frequency.

4. Teachers' rationales for following particular pedagogical procedures for reading and language arts instruction.
5. Analysis of the syntactic and semantic acceptability of nonstandard English oral reading miscues in relation to teachers' responses.
6. Finally, less than 19 percent of the children's oral reading miscues were related to nonstandard English use. Further research in children's code-switching during reading instruction would provide additional information about the probability of interference caused by the nonstandard features. The low rate of nonstandard English use may be insufficient to generate negative responses and may, therefore, not be a factor in reading instruction.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aaron, R., and Powell, G. "Feedback Practices as a Function of Teacher and Pupil Race During Reading Group Instruction." The Journal of Negro Education, 51, 1 (1982): 57-59.

Allington, R. L. "Teacher Interruption Behaviors During Primary-Grade Oral Reading." Journal of Educational Psychology, 72, 3 (1980): 371-377.

Bacon, J. A. "The Effect of Teacher Responses to Oral Reading Errors on Comprehension and Reading Behavior." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1982.

Baratz, J., and Shuy, R. Teaching Black Children to Read. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

_____. A Bidialectal Test for Determining Language Proficiency. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 020519, 1968.

_____. "Linguistic and Cultural Factors in Teaching Reading to Ghetto Children." Elementary English, 2 (1969): 199-203.

Batty, B. R., and Batty, C. J. Teaching Minority Children to Read. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, November 1978.

Berdan, R. "Knowledge into Practice: Delivering Research to Teachers." In M. Whiteman (Ed.), Reactions to Ann Arbor: Vernacular Black English and Education. Arlington, Virginia: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1980.

Bereiter, C., and Engleman, S. Teaching Disadvantaged Children in the Pre-School. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1966.

Billiard, C., and Driscoll, R. L. A Study of Dialect Preparation of Student Teachers in an Urban Teacher Education Center Program. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 177099, 1980.

Brophy, J. E., and Good, T. L. Teacher-Student Relationships. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

Burling, R. English in Black and White. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.

Carter, T. P. "Cultural Content for Linguistically Different Learners." Elementary English, XLVIII, 2 (1971): 162-175.

Clark, K. B. Crisis in Urban Education. John H. Fulton Lecture. Vermont: Middlebury College, 1971.

Dale, P. S. Language Development: Structure and Function (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

Delamont, S. Interaction in the Classroom. London: Methuen and Company, 1976.

Erickson, F. D. "'F'get you honky!" A New Look at Black Dialect and the School." Elementary English, XIVI, 4 (1969).

Goodman, K. "Dialect Barriers to Reading Comprehension Revisited." In A. W. Heilman, Principles and Practices of Teaching Reading (4th ed.). Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1977.

_____. "Effective Teachers of Reading Know Language and Children." Elementary English, 51, 6 (1974): 825-828.

Goodman, Y. M., and Sims, R. "Whose Dialect for Beginning Readers." Elementary English, 51, 6 (1974): 837-841.

Gushkin, J. T. The Social Perception of Language Dialect and Expectations of Ability. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, March 1970.

Hall, V. C., and Turner, R. K. "The Validity of the Different Language Explanation for Poor Scholastic Performance of Black Students." Review of Educational Research, 44 (1974): 69-81.

Hall, W. S. "Projecting the Issue into Time: What Do We Know and Where Do We Go From Here." In M. Whiteman (Ed.), Reactions to Ann Arbor: Vernacular Black English and Education. Arlington, Virginia: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1980.

Haskins, J., and Butts, H. "Don' say no mo' wid yo' mouf dan yo' back kin stan'" The Psychology of Black Language. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.

Hewitt, N. "Reactions of Prospective English Teachers Toward Speakers of a Nonstandard Dialect." Language Learning, 21 (2): 205-212.

Heilman, A. W. Principles and Practices of Teaching Reading. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1977.

Hoover, M. R., et al. CERAS Test Battery: Tests of Black English for Teachers of Bidialectal Students (TBETB). Stanford, California: Center for Educational Research at Stanford, 1979. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 173827.

Hunt, B. C. "Black Dialect and Third and Fourth Graders' Performance on the Gray Oral Reading Test." Reading Research Quarterly, 10 (1974-1975): 103-123.

Johnson, K. "Teacher's Attitude Toward the Nonstandard Negro Dialect--Let's Change It." Elementary English, XLVIII, 2 (1971): 175-184.

Jones, D. M. "Ebonics and Reading." Journal of Black Studies, 9 (1979): 423-448.

Kossack, S. "District Court's Ruling on Nonstandard Dialects Needs Cautious Interpretation." Phi Delta Kappan, (1980): 617-619.

Labov, W. "Some Sources of Reading Problems for Negro Speakers of Nonstandard English." In A. Frazier (Ed.), New Directions in Elementary English. Champion, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1967.

_____. "The Logic of Nonstandard English." In N. Keddie (Ed.), The Myth of Cultural Deprivation. Hammondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973.

Lamberg, W. J., and McCaleb, J. L. "Performance by Prospective Teachers in Distinguishing Dialect Features and Miscues Unrelated to Dialect." Journal of Reading, 20, 7 (1977): 581-584.

Landry, C. R. The Effects of a Program in Black English on the Attitude of Elementary Teachers Toward Nonstandard Speakers, 1976. (Document available from University Microfilms, P.O. Box 1764, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106.)

Lass, B. "Improving Reading Skills: The Relationship Between Oral Language of Black English Speakers and Their Achievement." Urban Education, 14 (1980): 437-447.

Leu, Jr., D. J. "Oral Reading Analysis: A Critical of Research and Application." Reading Research Quarterly, XVII, 3 (1982): 420-437.

Lewis, S. "Teacher Attitude Change: Does Informing Make a Difference." In M. Whiteman (Ed.), Reactions to Ann Arbor: Vernacular Black English and Education. Arlington, Virginia: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1980.

Light, R. The Schools and the Minority Child's Language. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 047320.

Liu, S. F. "An Investigation of Oral Reading Miscues Made by Nonstandard Dialect Speaking Children." Reading Research Quarterly, 11 (1975-1976): 193-197.

Mathewson, G. "The Effects of Attitudes Upon Comprehension of Dialect Folk Tales." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1973.

Melmed, P. T. "Black English Phonology: The Question of Reading Interference." Monographs of the Language Behavior Research Laboratory. Berkeley, California: University of California, Berkeley, 1971 (No. 1).

Mitchell, K. A. "Patterns of Teacher-Student Responses to Oral Reading Errors as Related to Teachers' Theoretical Frameworks." Research in the Teaching of English, 14, 2 (1980): 243-263.

Monteith, M. K. "Black English, Teacher Attitudes, and Reading." Language Arts, 57, 8 (1980): 908-912.

_____. "Implications of the Ann Arbor Decision: Black English and the Reading Teacher." Journal of Reading, 23, 6 (1980): 556-558.

Nober, E. H., and Seymour, H. N. "Speaker Intelligibility of Black and White School Children for Black and White Listeners Under Varying Listening Conditions." Language and Speech, 22 (1979): 237-242.

Nolen, P. "Reading Nonstandard Dialect Materials: A Study of Grades Two and Four." Child Development, 43 (1972): 1092-1097.

Paulson, R. C. "Expectancy of Classroom Performance: The Effects of Students' Dialect, Students' Ethnicity and an Introduction to Sociolinguistics on Teacher Candidates' Perceptions." Doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University. Dissertation Abstracts, 1978 (University Microfilms, 39, No. 1-4, 10).

Piestrup, A. M. "Black Dialect Interference and Accommodations of Reading Instruction in First Grade." Monographs of the Language Behavior Research Laboratory, 1973, 4.

Pietras, T., and Lamb, P. "Attitudes of Selected Elementary Teachers Toward Black Dialect." Journal of Black Studies, 9 (1979): 411-422.

Politzer, R. L., and Lewis, S. A. R. "The Relationship of Black English Tests for Teachers and Selected Teaching Behaviors to Pupil Achievement, 1978." ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 013371.

Politzer, R. L., and Lewis, S. A. "Teacher Workshops, Black English Test for Teachers and Selected Teaching Behaviors and Their Relation to Pupil Achievement, 1980. ERIC Document Service No. ED 174986.

Rigg, P. "Dialects and/in/for Reading." Language Arts, 55 (1978): 285-292.

Roberts, L. G. "Observation and Analysis of First-Graders' Oral Reading Errors and Corrections, and the Accompanying Teacher Response and Teacher-Pupil Interaction." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1973.

Rosenshire, B., and Furst, N. "The Use of Direct Observation to Study Teaching." In R. Travers (Ed.), Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

Rystrom, R. "Dialect Training and Reading: A Further Look." Reading Research Quarterly, 5 (1970): 581-603.

Schaaf, E. "A Study of Black English Syntax and Reading Comprehension." Unpublished master's thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 1971.

Schwartz, J. "Dialect Interference in the Attainment of Literacy." Journal of Reading, 25, 5 (1982): 440-446.

Seymour, H. N., and Miller-Jones, D. "Language and Cognitive Assessment of Black Children." Speech and Language: Advances in Basic Research and Practice. New York: Academic Press, 1981.

Shuy, R. W. "Some Language and Cultural Differences in a Theory of Reading." In K. S. Goodman and J. T. Fleming (Eds.), Psycholinguistics and the Teaching of Reading. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1969.

_____. "The Mismatch of Child Language and School Language: Implications of Beginning Reading Instruction." In T. G. Walker and G. E. Mackinon (Eds.), Reading Research: Advances in Theory and Practice. New York: Academic Press, 1979.

Simons, H. D. "Black Dialect, Reading, Interference and Classroom Interaction." In T. G. Walker and G. E. Mackinon (Eds.), Reading Research: Advances in Theory and Practice. New York: Academic Press, 1979.

Simons, H. D., and Johnson, K. R. "Black English Syntax and Reading Interference." Research in the Teaching of English, 8 (1975): 339-358.

Sims, R. "A Psycholinguistic Description of Miscues Created by Selected Young Readers During Oral Reading of Text by Black Dialect and Standard English." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1972.

Smarr, J. L. "A Psycholinguistic Study of the Miscues and Selected Dialect Features Exhibited in the Oral Readings and Retellings of Two Groups of Down East Maine Dialect Speakers." Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1978. Dissertation Abstracts, 1978 (University Microfilms, 39, No. 1-4, 12).

Smith, F. "Making Sense of Reading and of Reading Instruction." Harvard Educational Review, 47, 3 (1977): 386-395.

Stubbs, M., and Delamont, S. (Eds.). Explorations in Classroom Observation. London: Wiley and Sons, 1976.

Torrey, J. "Illiteracy in the Ghetto." In N. Keddie (Ed.), The Myth of Cultural Deprivation. Hammondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973.

Tovey, D. R. "Teachers' Perceptions of Children's Reading Miscues." Reading Horizons, 19, 4 (1979): 302-307.

Troutman, D., and Falk, J. "Speaking Black English--Is There a Problem of Interference?" The Journal of Negro Education, 51, 2 (1982): 123-133.

Trudgill, P. Accent, Dialect and the School. London: Edward Arnold Publishers, 1979.

Venezky, R. L. "Nonstandard Language and Reading." Elementary English, XLVII, 3 (1970): 334-345.

Weber, R. "Dialect Differences in Oral Reading." In J. L. Laffrey and R. Shuy (Eds.), Language Differences: Do They Interfere? Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1973.

Weinstein, R. S. "Reading Group Membership in First Grade: Teacher Behaviors and Pupil Experience Over Time." Journal of Educational Psychology, 68, 1 (1976): 103-116.

Whatley, E. "Black English: Implications of the Ann Arbor Decision for the Classroom." In M. Whiteman (Ed.), Reactions to Ann Arbor: Vernacular Black English and Education. Arlington, Virginia: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1980.

Williams, F. "Psychological Correlates of Speech Characteristics: On Sounding Disadvantaged." Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 13 (1970): 472-488.

Williams, F.; Whitehead, J. L.; and Miller, L. "Relations Between Language Attitudes and Teacher Expectancy." American Educational Research Journal, 9, 2 (1972): 263-279.

Williams, M.; Weinstein, E.; and Blackwood, R. O. "An Analysis of Oral Reading Compared with Reading Achievement." Elementary English X2VII (3): 394-396.

Wolfram, W., and Fasold, R. W. The Study of Social Dialects in American English. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1974.

Wolfram, W., and Fasold, R. "Social Dialects and Education." In J. B. Pride (Ed.), Sociolinguistic Aspects of Language Learning and Teaching. Oxford: Oxford University, 1979.

Zintz, Miles V. The Reading Process: The Teacher and the Learner. Dubuque, Iowa: Brown, 1980.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:

CERAS TESTS OF BLACK ENGLISH FOR TEACHERS OF BIDIALECTAL STUDENTS (TBETB)

CERAS TESTS OF BLACK ENGLISH FOR TEACHERS OF BIDIALECTAL STUDENTS (TBETB)

TEST I

Form A - Modified

History and Structure

1. Black History is derived mainly from:

   a. West African and East African language dialects.

   b. West African and American Indian dialects.

   c. West African languages and certain dialects of the British Isles.

2. The Gullah (Geechee) dialect, spoken off the coast of South Carolina and the Sea Island coast has preserved its Creole features mainly because of:

   a. Cultural and geographic isolation from mainland culture.

   b. Racial characteristics since Gullahs are less racially mixed than other Blacks.

   c. Physiological differences in the oral cavity which affect sounds produced in the vocal tract.

3. The best explanation of why a Black child might pronounce the words land as lan' and help as he'p is that:

   a. Certain genetic qualities are inherent in Blacks.

   b. Some speech impediment is characteristic of that individual child.

   c. Certain rules are present in the sound system of the speech variety of his community.

4. Black English is likely to be most prominently spoken:

   a. Among Blacks who are least integrated with mainstream society.

   b. Wherever there are African descendants in an English environment.

   c. Among Blacks of age 50 and above who live in the Eastern United States.

5. Which of the following is true:

   a. Black English has no features in common with other varieties of American English.

   b. All Blacks speak Black English.

   c. Many of the characteristics of Black English are shared by many other vernacular speakers of American English.

6. Factors that have influenced the development of Black English in the United States are:

   a. Unlike those that have affected varieties of European languages spoken by Blacks (for example, Portuguese).

   b. Similar to those that have influenced the development of other varieties of English as spoken by Blacks (for example, Jamaican English).

   c. Explainable on the basis of the English spoken by whites (for example, Middle English).

7. Vernacular Black English is a language that:

   a. Has not developed any systematic grammar.

   b. Is still evolving on the basis of the social experiences of its speaker.

   c. Is unlike any other American dialect in that it retains many of the archaic features of older English dialects.

8. As a linguistic entity, Vernacular Black English is considered to:

   a. Be a type of American jargon based on spontaneous rules.

   b. Be a systematic, rule-governed language having several varieties.

   c. Have all of its grammatical features derived from African sources.

9. Which of the following sentences illustrates the use of the negative in Vernacular Black English?

   a. Didn't nobody take none of those books.

   b. He be waiting for me don't every night.

   c. Doesn't he want to go?

10. The use of the verb "to be" to signal habitual action in Vernacular Black English (such as "He always be running late") can be described as:

    a. An indication of a linguistic difference that interferes with the formulation of grammatical sentences.

    b. A form that is compatible with the habitual concept of time found in some West African languages.

    c. A conception of time which causes Black people to be time-oriented rather than place-oriented.

11. Choose the missing word or words that a Vernacular Black English speaker would be most likely to use to complete the phrase, "By the time I get back, you better _____ cleaned up this mess!"

    a. had

    b. got to

    c. be done

12. To emphasize the fact that the action of the sentence, "Willie finished that work," was completed at a much earlier point in time, a Vernacular Black English speaker would probably say:

    a. Willie <u>been</u> finished that work.

    b. Willie <u>did</u> finished that work.

    c. Willie <u>really</u> finished that work.

13. A close paraphrase of the Vernacular Black English and Southern English phrase, "I 'mo go down town," is:

    a. I am anxious to go downtown.

    b. I am going to go downtown.

    c. I'm the one that's going downtown.

14. The Vernacular Black English sentence, "Didn't nobody hit John," is best interpreted as meaning:

    a. Nobody wanted to hit John.

    b. Somebody hit John.

    c. Nobody hit John.

From the following sets, select the pair of words that may sound very much alike in the speech of Vernacular Black English speakers and some Southerners.

15.	a.	build	bill
	b.	boy	bop
	c.	blimp	bloom
16.	a.	tin	twin
	b.	tag	tack
	c.	tot	tote
17.	a.	make	mall
	b.	messed	mess
	c.	mom	mop
18.	a.	Bob	cob
	b.	Bess	best
	c.	ban	bam
19.	a.	roof	Ruth
	b.	room	rude
	c.	row	tow
20.	a.	help	hep
	b.	who	hot
	c.	hip	hop
21.	a.	cow	cot
	b.	Carl	cart
	c.	Cal	Carol
22.	a.	for	fur
	b.	five	jive
	c.	film	fill
23.	a.	bud	butt
	b.	reckon	raccoon
	c.	broom	brim
24.	a.	toe	tore
	b.	time	tire
	c.	telegraph	telegram
25.	a.	apple	axle
	b.	and	ain't
	c.	asked	axed

Select the most pronounced Vernacular Black English and sometimes Southern phrases in each of the following sets of sentences.

26. a. John a student
    b. John dones student work
    c. John a study

27. a. readin' tests
    b. reading n' writing
    c. readin' tes'

28. a. He aimed kinda high
    b. He be going to the store
    c. Be you go?

29. a. She seem tall
    b. She be seem
    c. She talled

30. a. My mother, they
    b. My mother ised
    c. My mother, she

31. a. three coat
    b. forthy dollars
    c. two-by-two

32. a. The money arrived
    b. Bob money
    c. Root monies

33. Black English is best described as:

    a. Vernacular or informal Black speech used by Northern, urban males.

    b. A way of talking proper in order to impress one's audience.

    c. The range of speech behaviors used in Black communities in the United States.

34. The identical pronunciation of pen and pin is an example of:

    a. Not paying precise attention to configuration clues and the difference in the vowel sounds.

    b. Poor auditory discrimination prevalent among nonmainstream speakers.

    c. The overlap between some varieties of Black, Southern, and general American English.

35. Vernacular Black English speaker who says, "John loud-talked me" is:

    a. Communicating that John is hard of hearing.

    b. Probably far away from John.

    c. Likely to be embarrassed or amused by what John said.

36. A Black English speaker is likely to "cop a plea" when:

    a. Employing a defensive strategy.

    b. Quoting a policeman.

    c. Imitating a lawyer.

37. You have just said, "Sit down and take this test." You immediately hear, following the statement, a Black child mimicking exactly what you said, with her hand on her hip. This is:

    a. A demonstration of a different attitude towards adults found in the Black community.

    b. A Black speech event called "marking."

    c. A ritualistic utterance characteristic of children who are culturally different.

38. You hear one Black child tell another, "Everybody has a cross to bear." The other child says, "What is your cross?" The first child responds, "You." And the entire group laughs. This is an example of:

    a. A Black event called "capping."

    b. A Black speech event called "playing the dozens."

    c. A Black religious ritual.

39. "Shucking" is:

    a. Removing the leaves and silk from ears of corn.

    b. Running a game on someone.

    c. Living with a member of the opposite sex.

40. High John the Conqueror is:

    a. A religious leader in the Black church.

    b. A root used for healing and religious purposes.

    c. A famous slave holder.

CERAS TESTS OF BLACK ENGLISH FOR TEACHERS OF BIDIALECTAL STUDENTS (TBETB)

TEST II

Form A - Modified

Language Arts Pedagogy

1. In an elementary class, a Vernacular Black English speaking child is most likely to:

   a. Pronounce or use words different from Standard English but still understand Standard English.

   b. Not be able to speak aloud or understand the teacher's language.

   c. Pronounce or use words in Vernacular Black English but not understand Vernacular Black English.

2. In teaching students to write Standard English compositions:

   a. The first step is the correction of all vernacular English words and sentence structures.

   b. One should not suggest any changes in the student's grammar as long as the composition is well-structured.

   c. One may praise the organization of composition even though it contains vernacular grammatical features.

3. Which of the following statements is true?

   a. All whites belong to the same cultural group.

   b. Every person is a member of at least one ethnic or cultural group.

   c. We have one American pluralistic culture which applies to us all.

4. A description of a speaker's accent depends primarily on:

   a. The speaker's inability to articulate clearly.

   b. The hearer's perception of the speech.

   c. A dictionary's description of correct speech.

5. Many people often retain the sound patterns of their first language when speaking a second language because:

   a. The second language is perceived and processed in terms of the first language.

   b. The second language is phonologically more complex than the first.

   c. The first language has, over time, become adapted to characteristics of the vocal organs of its speakers.

6. Recent research suggests that Black parents are least likely to object to the use of Vernacular Black English in the school when their children are:

   a. Reading their textbooks.

   b. Writing class assignments.

   c. Speaking to their peers.

7. The Sullivan Programmed Reading Series is one of the few elementary reading methods that:

   a. Uses a decoding (phonic) approach.

   b. Is correctable by the child.

   c. Is written with a different alphabet.

8. Three common characteristics of predominantly Black schools where children are learning to read successfully are:

   a. A look-say approach to reading, a permissive approach to discipline and modern facilities.

   b. A language experience approach to reading, stimulus-response approach to discipline and teachers under 30 years of age.

   c. A decoding approach to reading a structured approach to discipline and high teacher expectations.

9. The "schwa" is:

   a. One of the letters in a consonant cluster.

   b. A nonsense syllable used to teach children on Sesame Street.

   c. The "uh" sound that occurs when a vowel is unstressed.

10. The Initial Teaching Alphabet method is:

    a. A British reading program based on highlighting and coloring certain letters in print.

    b. A British reading program that changes the alphabet to produce more predictable sound-symbol relationships.

    c. A reading program that uses only capital letters so as not to confuse the beginning reader.

11. The Language Experience Approach is a reading method in which:

    a. Children read stories written by computer analysis of regular sound-syllable correspondence.

    b. Children read stories written by linguistic experts.

    c. Children read stories written by themselves.

12. If a Vernacular Black English speaker pronounces "this" as "dis" and "bathtub" as "baftub," his pronunciation will:

    a. Not necessarily reflect his comprehension of these lexical items.

    b. Predict his verbal ability.

    c. Indicate the need for assistance from the speech teacher.

13. The Lippincott Reading Series is one of the few decoding (phonic) reading approaches that:

    a. Is based on spelling patterns.

    b. Has a basal-reader format.

    c. Is written in syllabary format.

14. The decision to use Vernacular Black English forms in the classroom as an effective curricular strategy for Black students should be based on:

    a. A random selection of common phrases and/or idioms used by Black Americans adopted for classroom use.

    b. The presence or absence of the forms in the dictionary or thesaurus.

    c. A systematic analysis of the structure of Vernacular Black and other American English and community usage.

15. Vocabulary for sight-symbol reading materials is selected according to:

    a. Regularity of sound-symbol correspondence.

    b. Frequency of word usage counts.

    c. Random selection of dictionary items.

16. "Oh, look. See Spot. See Spot run" is an example of:

    a. Phonic or decoding reading approach.

    b. Sight-word reading approach.

    c. The existentialist reading approach.

17. "Spot is hot on top" is an example of:

    a. Existentialist reading approach.

    b. Sight-word reading approach.

    c. Phonic or decoding reading approach.

18. A digraph is:

    a. A spelling pattern made up of two consonants with each consonant representing a separate sound. (<u>bl</u>ack)

    b. A spelling pattern in which two consonants represent a different sound than either consonant by itself. (<u>ch</u>ick)

    c. A spelling pattern in which only the first consonant represents a sound. (la<u>mb</u>)

19. An example of a typical sentence in a phonic-linguistic method primer would be:

    a. Big pig is in bed.

    b. Please telephone the trucking company.

    c. See mother. Mother can ride.

20. Vocabulary items for phonic or decoding reading materials are selected according to:

    a. Random selection of dictionary items.

    b. Regularity of sound-symbol correspondence.

    c. Word-usage frequency counts.

BLACK ENGLISH FOR TEACHERS OF BIDIALECTAL STUDENTS (TBETB) ANSWER KEY

TEST I

Form A - Modified

History and Structure of Black English

1. c	21. c
2. a	22. a
3. c	23. a
4. a	24. a
5. c	25. c
6. b	26. a
7. b	27. c
8. b	28. b
9. a	29. a
10. b	30. c
11. c	31. a
12. a	32. b
13. b	33. c
14. c	34. c
15. a	35. c
16. b	36. a
17. b	37. b
18. b	38. a
19. a	39. b
20. a	40. b

BLACK ENGLISH FOR TEACHERS OF BIDIALECTAL STUDENTS (TBETB) ANSWER KEY

TEST II

Form A - Modified

Language Arts Pedagogy

1. a	11. c
2. c	12. a
3. b	13. a
4. b	14. c
5. a	15. a
6. c	16. b
7. b	17. c
8. c	18. b
9. c	19. a
10. b	20. b

RELIABILITY SCORES OF PRE- AND POST-TEST OF THE TESTS OF BLACK ENGLISH FOR TEACHERS OF BIDIALECTAL STUDENTS (TBETB)

TEST	NO. OF TEACHERS	ITEMS	MEAN SCORES	S.D.	CRONBACH A
History and Structure					
Pretest (Form A)	79	44	30.43	7.45	0.87
Posttest (Form B)	69	44	33.13	8.13	9.91
Language Arts Pedagogy					
Pretest (Form A)	79	16	11.20	3.85	.84
Posttest (Form B)	69	16	12.11	3.66	.83

APPENDIX B:

SENTENCE REPETITION TASK

SENTENCE REPETITION TASK

Directions: Listen carefully. I'm going to say some sentences. You say them after me, one at a time. When we're through, you can hear yourself on the tape recorder. Are you ready? You say the sentence after me.

Sentences:

1. Sometimes after school, I watch television.
2. My friend has a little kitten.
3. Charles said he'd be in class after lunch.
4. Here's what I like.
5. His father dresses up and walks around in his knickerbockers.
6. My daddy wears boots when we go fishing.
7. My brother is five years old because his birthday passed.
8. I found a whole bunch of weeds at the park.
9. I'd say, take off that mask.
10. I'll pick him up and throw him out.
11. My teacher is going to take us to the zoo.
12. We're going to see an alligator and a garter snake and a hippopotamus.
13. Henry lives near the ball park but can't go to the games because he has no money.

    (Henry live beside the ball park but he can't go to the games 'cause he ain' got no money.)
14. If I give you three dollars, will you buy me the things that I need to make the wagon.

    (If I give you three dolar, you gonna' buy what I need to make the wagon.)

15. When the teacher asked if he had done his homework, Henry said, "I din't do it."

    (When the teachah aks Henry did he do his homework, Henry say, "I ain't did it.")

APPENDIX C:

OBSERVATION RECORDING SHEET FOR PUPIL MISCUES AND TEACHER RESPONSES

OBSERVATION RECORDING SHEET FOR PUPIL MISCUES AND TEACHER RESPONSES

Date: _____ Teacher: A B
(Circle One)

SESSION: _____ Group: _____

Pupils	Content	Teacher Responses

APPENDIX D:

ORAL READING OBSERVATIONAL SYSTEM
OBSERVER MANUAL

ORAL READING OBSERVATIONAL SYSTEM

OBSERVER MANUAL*

This system is designed to code reader and teacher verbal and non-verbal behaviors that occur during an error episode.

Error episode (miscue episode) in this study refers to a sequence of pupil-teacher behaviors set off from preceding and succeeding events by the following boundaries: the occurrence of a reading error . . . the resolution of the error and/or the continuation of reading with no further teaching or pupil response related to the error.

Reading error (oral reading miscue) in this study refers to the single word as stimulus and an oral response (complete or incomplete) or lack of response to it. In the case of reversals on a string of adjacent written words, the unit of error contains more than one word. In the case of omissions or insertions of more than one word in a single sentence, the group of words (phrase, sentence, line, etc.) is counted as one error.

Self-correction refers to the correction of errors by the reader, with or without teacher prompting. Prompting includes all information supplied to the reader with the exception of the complete correct response to the error. A complete correct response by the teacher or another pupil precludes the categorization of a self-correction.

---

*Modification in terminology or coding appear in parenthesis.

A total of twenty-seven behavioral categories are defined: eleven categories of pupil behavior related to reading errors and corrections; fifteen categories of teacher behavior; and one category related to other pupil correction. Observers will be concerned with both verbal behavior (overt statements) and non-verbal behavior (overt actions, gestures, positions and facial expressions) as specified in the following categories.

Reader Behavioral Categories

Code	Definition	Record on Text Copy
01	Incomplete Response. Verbalizes an incomplete response (e.g., sounds first letter or part of word) and/or repeats prior word(s).	/m/ Then the man . . . Then the/man . . .
04	Substitution. Substitutes a word(s) for the given text (e.g., "When the man . . ." for "Then the man . . .").	When Then the man . . .
05	Omission. Omits a word(s) from the text (e.g., "The man . . ." for "Then the man . . .").	(Then) the man . . .
06	Addition. Inserts a word(s) not in the text (e.g., "Then the little old man . . ." for "Then the man . . .").	little old Then the man . . .
07	Scramble. Reverses or confuses the order of words in the text (e.g., "The man then . . ." for "Then the man . . .").	(Then the man) . . .
31	Non-Verbal Scanning. Looks at the text (not at the teacher) with some indication of attempted reading (e.g., eye movement, finger pointing, lip movement, etc.).	31/Then the man . . .

Code	Definition	Record on Text Copy
02	Requests Help. Does not attempt word, asks for help (e.g., "What's that?"; "I don't know this word.") and/or looks up and turns to teacher or another pupil. (Circle code if solely non-verbal behavior occurs.)	02/Then the man . . . (02)/Then the man . . .
03	Waiting. Sits passively, not looking at text or teacher or other pupil.	03/Then the man . . .
08	Repeated-Correction. Repeats the correct response supplied by the teacher or another pupil.	(When)08 Then the man . . .
09	Self-Correction. Corrects error with or without teacher prompting.	(When)09 Then the man . . .
10	Other. Confusion, unintelligible pupil responses and/or miscellaneous error or correction behavior not defined in above categories.	10/Then the boy . . .

Teacher Behavioral Categories

NOTE: Only reading errors (miscues) and corrections are recorded on the text copy. Code the full sequence of behaviors (reader and teacher) for each error episode (miscue episode) on the Oral Reading Observation Coding Sheets.

Code	Definition
11	Supplies Correction. Corrects the reader's erroneous response or supplies word(s) that the child failed to read.
12	Calls on Another Child to Correct. Asks another child to correct the reader's erroneous response or supply word(s) that reader failed to read. Points to another child or gestures that he supply correction. (Circle code if solely non-verbal behavior occurs.)

Code	Definition
13	Positive Feedback. Positively reinforces reader's response with praise (e.g., "Good for you." "That's right!" "Nice try.") and/or smile or gesture (e.g., pats child encouragingly). (Circle code if solely non-verbal behavior occurs.)
14	Negative Feedback. Indicates disapproval or criticizes child's response with a statement (e.g., "No!" "That's wrong.") and/or frown or disapproving gesture. (Circle code if solely non-verbal behavior occurs.)
15	Error Feedback. Signals that an error has been made, but provides no evaluative response or any specific information about the error (e.g., models incorrect response: "What did you say?"; points to word read incorrectly; looks at child with a warning glance). (Circle code if solely non-verbal behavior occurs.)
16	Constructive Feedback. Indicates those aspects of the erroneous response which are themselves correct (e.g., "Yes, this word begins like make, however . . ." "'Little' fits in the sentence, but this word doesn't begin with an 'l'.").
17	Provides Decoding Cue. Provides information relating to the decodable aspects of the word(s), i.e., letters, sound-symbol cues, prefix, suffix, part of the compound word. Points to, writes, or underlines specific word elements to help reader analyze the word(s). (Circle code if solely non-verbal behavior occurs.)
18	Provides Contextual Cue. Provides semantic and/or syntactic information (e.g., "The opposite of big." "Sam was a _____ dog." "He was _____." Points to picture clue, or to some object. Writes phrases on blackboard with key word missing.) (Circle code if solely non-verbal behavior occurs.)
19	Suggests Decoding Strategy. Provides no specific cue, but suggests a decoding strategy to help the pupil arrive at the correct answer (e.g., "Sound it out." "Look at the parts of the word." "How does it begin?").
20	Suggests Contextual Strategy. Provides no specific cue, but suggests that pupil use the context (e.g., "Does that make sense?" "What would fit in this sentence?" "Use the context.").

Code	Definition
21	Suggests Re-Read. Suggests the child re-read the sentence or a portion of the sentence as a means of working out an error (e.g., "Go back and try the sentence again." "Re-read the sentence.")
22	Suggests Read Ahead. Asks the child to continue on with the sentence, as a way of working out an unknown word or incorrect response (e.g., "Go on and finish the sentence [paragraph] and see if you can figure out this word." "Read ahead." "Keep going.").
23	Waiting. Delays making a response to the reader's error for three seconds, or simply waits while reader works out difficulties (e.g., watches child, turns toward child, looks up from text and looks at child).
24	No-Response. Does not respond verbally or non-verbally to reader's error.
25	Other. Instances of confusion or unclear responses, and/or miscellaneous behaviors not defined above (e.g., "Read louder so we can hear you.").

Other Pupil Behavioral Category

Code	Definition
26	Spontaneously Supplies Correction. Another pupil in the reading group spontaneously corrects the reader's error or supplies the word(s) which the reader failed to read. (Roberts, 1973)

APPENDIX E:

ORAL READING OBSERVATIONAL CODING SHEET

ORAL READING OBSERVATIONAL CODING SHEET

Reader										
Sex Group										
BE Group										
Teacher										
Session										
Instructional Material										
Page										
Start										

(Roberts, 1973)

APPENDIX F:

MEANS FOR TEACHER RESPONSES TO NONSTANDARD ENGLISH MISCUES BY LANGUAGE CATEGORIES AND TEACHER

MEANS FOR TEACHER RESPONSES TO MISCUES
BY LANGUAGE CATEGORIES AND TEACHER

N = 57	TEACHER ONE 1 STRONG	2 MILD	3 WEAK	GRAND MEAN	TEACHER TWO 1 STRONG	2 MILD	3 WEAK	GRAND MEAN
No Response	13.14	7.93	6.22	8.61	7.25	3.44	3.50	4.04
Teacher Supplies Correction	10.00	6.93	9.67	8.42	9.0	3.0	3.17	3.96
Positive Feedback	1.14	.87	.89	.94	1.75	2.81	1.50	2.35
Decoding Cue	.29	.20	.89	.42	4.75	2.19	3.00	2.77
Decoding Strategy	.14	.53	.56	.45	.75	.81	1.00	.85
Error Feedback	.43	.73	.33	.55	2.00	.50	.33	.69
Other/Expression	1.71	.53	1.11	.97	.00	.00	.00	.00
Re-Read	.00	.13	.11	.10	2.00	.63	.33	.77
Constructive Feedback	.29	.20	.11	.19	.75	.06	.33	.23
Calls Other Child	.29	.27	.22	.26	.00	.00	.50	.12
Other/Place	.43	.27	.22	.29	.00	.00	.00	.00
Contextual Cue	.00	.20	.00	.10	.50	.19	.00	.19
Other	.14	.07	.11	.10	.00	.13	.17	.12
Contextual Strategy	.14	.07	.00	.06	.25	.00	.00	.04
Negative Feedback	.00	.07	.00	.03	.00	.06	.00	.04